THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

ry

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

616992

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES.

FOURTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT
OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

3 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CXIX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTH DAY OF MARCH TO THE TWENTY-THIRD DAY OF MARCH, 1903.

SECOND VOLUME OF SESSION

1903.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE LONDON

8472

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_march-6-23-1903_119

Chronology of "The Parliamentary Debates."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 Will. I. to 34 Geo. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 Geo. III. to 40 Geo. III.
1760-1800

(First Parliament.)

Vol. 35	41	Geo. III.	1801
— 36	42	—	1802

(Second Parliament.)

Vol. 36	42	Geo. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(Second Parliament—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44	Geo. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45	—	1805
— 6 & 7	46	—	1806

(Third Parliament.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47	Geo. III.	1806-7

(Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48	Geo. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49	—	1809
— 15 — 17	50	—	1810
— 18 — 20	51	—	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52	—	1812

(Fifth Parliament.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53	Geo. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54	—	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55	—	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56	—	1816
— 35 & 36	57	—	1817
— 37 — 38	58	—	1818

(Sixth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59	Geo. III.	1819
— 41	60	—	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(Seventh Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1	Geo. IV.	1820
4 & 5	2	—	1821
— 6 — 7	3	—	1822
— 8 — 9	4	—	1823
— 10 — 11	5	—	1824
— 12 — 13	6	—	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7	—	1826

(Eighth Parliament.)

Vol. 16	7	Geo. IV.	1826
— 17	8	—	1827
— 18 & 19	9	—	1828
— 20 — 21	10	—	1829
— 22 to 25	11	—	1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1	Will. IV.	1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol. 4 to 8	2	Will. IV.	1831
— 9 — 14	3	—	1832

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol. 15 to 20	4	Will. IV.	1833
— 21 — 25	5	—	1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol. 26 to 30	6	Will. IV.	1835
— 31 — 35	7	—	1836
— 36 — 38	8	—	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	39 to 44	1	VICTORIA	1838
—	45 — 50	2	—	1839
—	51 — 55	3	—	1840
—	56 — 58	4	—	(a) 1841

(FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	59	4	VICTORIA	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65	5	—	1842
—	66 — 71	6	—	1843
—	72 — 76	7	—	1844
—	77 — 82	8	—	1845
—	83 — 88	9	—	1846
—	89 — 94	10	—	(a) 1847

(FIFTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	95	10	VICTORIA	(b) 1847
—	96 to 101	11	—	1848
—	102 —107	12	—	1849
—	108 —113	13	—	1850
—	114 —118	14	—	1851
—	119 —122	15	—	(a) 1852

(SIXTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	123	15	VICTORIA	(b) 1852
—	124 to 129	16	—	1853
—	130 —135	17	—	1854
—	136 —139	18	—	1855
—	140 —143	19	—	1856
—	144	20	—	(a) 1857

(SEVENTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	145 to 147	20	VICTORIA	(b) 1857
—	148 —151	21	—	1858
—	152 —153	22	—	(a) 1859

(EIGHTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	154 to 155	22	VICTORIA	(b) 1859
—	156 —160	23	—	1860
—	161 —164	24	—	1861
—	165 —168	25	—	1862
—	169 —172	26	—	1863
—	173 —176	27	—	1864
—	177 —180	28	—	1865

(NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	181 to 184	29	VICTORIA	1866
—	185 —189	30	—	1867
—	190 —193	31	—	1867-8

(TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	194 to 198	32	VICTORIA	1868-9
—	199 —203	33	—	1870
—	204 —208	34	—	1871
—	209 —213	35	—	1872
—	214 —217	36	—	1873

(TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	218 to 221	37	VICTORIA	1874
—	222 —226	38	—	1875
—	227 —231	39	—	1876
—	232 —236	40	—	1877
—	237 —242	41	—	1878
—	243 —249	42	—	1878-9
—	250 & 251	43	—	(a) 1880

(TWENTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	252 to 256	43	VICTORIA	(b) 1880
—	257 —265	44	—	1881
—	266 —273	45	—	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275	45	—	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283	46	—	1883
—	284 —292	47	—	1884
—	293 —301	48	—	1884-5

(TWENTY-THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	302 to 307	49	VICTORIA	(a) 1886

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	308 & 309	49	VICTORIA	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321	50	—	1887
—	322 —332	51	—	1888
—	333 —340	52	—	1889
—	341 —348	53	—	1890
—	349 —356	54	—	1890-1

Fourth Series.

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	VICTORIA	1892

(TWENTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	7	56	VICTORIA	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	36	59	VICTORIA	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	88	64	VICTORIA	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	EDWARD VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	1902
—	118 to 119	3	—	1903

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury and Lord Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour.
Lord President of the Council——His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, K.G.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Earl of Halsbury.
Secretaries of State——
  Foreign Affairs——Most Hon. the Marquess of Lansdowne, K.G.
  Home Department——Rt. Hon. A. Akers-Douglas, M.P.
  Colonial——Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, M.P.
  War——Rt. Hon. W. St. John Brodrick, M.P.
  India——Rt. Hon. Lord George Hamilton, M.P.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. Chas. T. Ritchie, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Selborne.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. Gerald W. Balfour, M.P.
Postmaster-General——Rt. Hon. Austen Chamberlain, Esq., M.P.
Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. Walter H. Long, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. R. W. Hanbury, M.P.
President of the Board of Education——The Most Noble the Marquess of Londonderry.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. George Wyndham, M.P.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——Sir A. Acland-Hood, Bt., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——W. Hayes Fisher, Esq., M.P.
Secretary of the Board of Education——Sir William Anson, Bt., M.P.
Secretary to the Admiralty——Hugh O. Arnold-Forster, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Treasury——
  H. T. Anstruther, Esq., M.P.
  Hon. Ailwyn Fellowes, M.P.
  H. W. Forster, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Admiralty——
  Admiral Lord W. T. Kerr, K.C.B.
  Admiral Sir John Fisher, G.C.B.
  Rear-Admiral W. H. May, M.V.O.
  Rear-Admiral John Durnford, C.B., D.S.O.
Civil Lord of the Admiralty——E. G. Pretyman, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Foreign Office——Lord Cranborne, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Home Office——Hon. T. H. Cochrane, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G.
Parliamentary Secretary, India Office——Rt. Hon. Earl Percy, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Hardwicke.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——A. Bonar Law, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——J. Grant Lawson, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary, War Office——Lord Stanley, M.P.
Attorney-General——Sir R. B. Finlay, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Rt. Hon. Sir E. Carson, K.C., M.P.
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Walrond, Bt., M.P.
First Commissioner of Works——Rt. Hon. Lord Windsor.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE

Judge Advocate-General——Rt. Hon. Sir F. H. Jeune, K.C.B., President Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Earl of Clarendon.
Vice-Chamberlain——Sir A. Acland-Hood, Bt., M.P.
Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, G.C.V.O.
Master of the Horse——His Grace the Duke of Portland, K.G., G.C.V.O.
Paymaster-General——His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.
Comptroller of the Household——Viscount Valentia, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Victor C. W. Cavendish, Esq., M.P.
Master of the Buckhounds——Right Hon. Lord Chesham.
Captain Yeomen of the Guard—Rt. Hon. Earl Waldegrave.
Lords-in-Waiting——
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Kintore, G.C.M.G.
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Denbigh.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Churchill, K.C.V.O.
- Rt. Hon. Earl Howe.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Lawrence.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Bagot.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Suffield, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Kenyon.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.
Lord Justice-General——Rt. Hon. J. B. Balfour.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. A. Graham Murray, K.C., M.P.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinsburgh, C.B.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of Montrose, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Rt. Hon. Earl of Leven and Melville.
Solicitor-General——Charles Scott Dickson, Esq., K.C., M.P.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
Chief Secretary——Rt. Hon. George Wyndham, M.P.
Under Secretary——Sir Antony McDonnell.
Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction——President: The Rt. Hon. the Chief Secretary for Ireland; Vice-President: Rt. Hon. Horace Plunkett.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Geo. Wright, Esq., K.C.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Morley.
Clerk of Parliaments——Henry J. L. Graham, Esq., C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Taxing Officer of Private Bill Costs——R. W. Monro, Esq.
Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
- Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
- Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
- Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
- Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.

Other Clerks——W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.; Hon. A. McDonnell; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills); H. P. St. John, Esq.; V. M. Biddulph, Esq.; Hon. E. A. Stonor; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq.; C. Headlam, Esq.; J. B. Hotham, Esq.; E. C. Vigors, Esq.; and A. Tennyson, Esq.
Accountant——G. Fulkes, Esq.
Copyist——Mr. T. A. Court; Assistant Copyist——Mr. H. P. Norris.
Messengers——Messrs. A. A. Worfell, C. E. Chizlett, A. M. Stoll, J. W. F. Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip.
Librarian——S. Arthur Strong, Esq.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.
Attendant——Mr. W. Worfell.
Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.; Clerk ——B. H. Fell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Gen. Sir Michael A. S. Biddulph, G.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.—(*Cont.*)

Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.

Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.

First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane.

Second Class Assistants——Messrs. B. Gallop, H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.

Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.

Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, J. B. Forsyth, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates.

Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.

Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. T. Kendrick.

Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. C. J. Williams.

Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. A. P. Patey.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtney Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.

Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.

Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.

Principal Clerks——

- Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq.
- Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
- Committee Office——R. Dickinson, Esq.
- Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.

Senior Clerks——F. St. George Tupper, Esq.; H. C. Tower, Esq.; C. V. Frere, Esq.; L. T. Le Marchant, Esq.; G. C. Giffard, Esq.; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.

Assistant Clerks——S. L. Simeon, Esq.; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq.; E. C. Howe Browne, Esq.; Horace West, Esq.; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq.; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq.; Percy A. Bull, Esq.; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq.; W. E. Grey, Esq.; F. C. Holland, Esq.; J. W. G. Bond, Esq.

Junior Clerks——H. C. Dawkins, Esq.; A. F. B. Williams, Esq.; R. P. Colomb, Esq.; B. H. Fell, Esq.; R. E. Childers, Esq.; J. Scott Porter, Esq.; F. C. Bramwell, Esq.; W. T. Legge, Esq.; C. R. Turner, Esq.; W. K. Gibbons, Esq.; A. E. A. W. Smyth, Esq.; K. J. C. Moorsom, Esq.; C. D. Robertson, Esq.; R. D. Radcliffe, Esq.

Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. Erskine, Esq.

Deputy Serjeant——F. R. Gosset, Esq.

Assistant Sergeant——W. H. Erskine, Esq.

Chaplain to the House——Rev. Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce, D.D.

Secretary to the Speaker——Edward Gully, Esq.

Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. Chandos Leigh, K.C., K.C.B.

Trainbearer——Mr. J. French.

Messenger——Mr. W. Murrell.

Collectors of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. Lockton, Esq.

Referee of Private Bills——Alfred Bonham Carter, Esq., C.B.

Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.

Taxing Master——C. W. Campion, Esq.; Clerk——B. H. Fell, Esq.

Vote Office——

- Chief Clerk——H. A. M. Killick, Esq.
- Assistant Clerks——Philip Smith, Esq.; H. Otway Mayne, Esq.
- Messenger——Mr. John Edwards.

Librarian——R. C. Walpole, Esq.; Assistant Librarian——Temple Francks, Esq., B.C.L.; Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. Crimp, Wm. Stewart; Messengers——Messrs. A. Firmin, W. Hague.

Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.

Printers——

- Journals——G. E. Briscoe Eyre, Esq.
- Votes——J. B. Nichols, Esq.

Postmaster——Mr. Edmund W. Pike; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. Glynn

Office Keeper——Mr. W. Harvey.

Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. Fielden Mitchell.

Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. Taylor.

Messengers——Messrs. J. J. Shelvey, C. Davie, W. Quantrill, H. Jones, G. D. Weller, J. Armstrong, J. Woodward, J. Ivory, G. Norman.

Doorkeepers——Mr. W. Wilson, Mr. M. Inglefield.

Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. Shearn.

Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. H. Hambling, Mr. C. Woodcraft, Mr. R. Robertson, Mr. J. Hills, Mr. J. Sprague, Mr. A. Andrews, Mr. T. B. Spray, Mr. G. Tye, Mr. E. Hobby, Mr. G. Anstey, Mr. J. H. Day.

Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. J. Henderson, G. Wainwright, J. Guyatt, R. Turtle, A. Haskell, A. C. Johnson, G. Clapperton, H. E. Linington.

Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. Henley; Assistant——Mr W. Broadbent; Porters——Messrs. J. Oram, T. Martin.

Chief Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. Scantlebury.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CXIX.

SECOND VOLUME OF SESSION, 1903.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Page

JEWISH COLONISATION ASSOCIATION.—Petition of the Jewish Colonisation Association, under their common seal, praying for leave to introduce a Bill to extend the powers of the Jewish Colonisation Association, and for other purposes, together with a copy of the proposed Bill annexed thereto; read, and referred to the Examiners 1

Life Association of Scotland Bill [H.L.]; Milford Docks Bill [H.L.]; India-rubber, Guttapercha, and Telegraph Works Company Bill [H.L.]; Lima Railways Bill [H.L.]; Sheffield and South Yorkshire Navigation Bill [H.L.]—Read 2^{a} 1

Manchester Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Second Reading (which stands appointed for Monday next) put off to Monday the 16th instant ... 1

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY.

(Recruiting)—Annual Report of the Inspector-General of Recruiting, for the year 1902.

(Estimates)—Memorandum of the Secretary of State relating to the Army Estimates for 1903–1904.

Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table... 2

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1903.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means ... 2

Mar. 6.] Page

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of Fermanagh (North Fermanagh), in the room of Edward Mervyn Archdale, esquire (Chiltern Hundreds).—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*) 3

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILL (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz.:—

London Hydraulic Power Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 3

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 63 has been complied with, viz.:—

Blackheath and Greenwich District Electric Light Bill.
Market Drayton Gas Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 3

PRIVATE BILL (PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS) (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for additional Provisions in the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz. :—

Coventry Electric Tramways Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 3

PETITIONS.

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Pitsligo; Longside; Tyrie; Kilbarchan; and Kildalton; to lie upon the Table 4

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1903–4 (VOTE ON ACCOUNT).—Estimate presented, showing the several Services for which a Vote on Account is required for the year ending 31st March, 1904 [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 58].

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House... 4

INQUIRY INTO CHARITIES (COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY).—Further Return relative thereto [ordered 14th February, 1900; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to be printed. [No. 59] 4

ALIENS.—Address for "Return showing the names of all aliens to whom certificates of naturalisation have been issued, and who have taken the oath of allegiance, between the first day of January, 1902, and the 31st day of December, 1902, giving the country and place of residence of the person naturalised, and including information as to any aliens who have, during the same period, obtained Acts of Naturalisation from the Legislature (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 184, of Session 1902)."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*) 4

Mar. 6.] Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS IN CAITHNESS.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 5

REPORT OF INSPECTOR OF FACTORIES—RETURN OF LEAD POISONING.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 5

CHURCH DISCIPLINE—PROSECUTIONS FOR.—Question, Mr. Cubitt (Surrey, Reigate); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 5

RAILWAYS IN WEST AFRICA—SHELFORD AND SON, OF LONDON.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 6

UGANDA RAILWAY—CROWN AGENTS' COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 6

SOUTH AFRICAN COSTABULARY—COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OF KIT.—Question, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 7

UGANDA RAILWAY—ENGINEERS' COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Lord Cranborne 7

ALIEN IMMIGRATION.—Question, Mr. Forde Ridley (Bethnal Green, S.W.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 7

VOLUNTEER RESIGNATIONS.—Question, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 8

Innkeepers' Liability Bill.—[SECOND READING.] Order for Second Reading read.

Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.) 8
Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester) 12

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Major Jameson (Clare, W.) 12
Mr. Patrick White (Meath, N.) 15

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Major Jameson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.) 17
Mr. Eugene Wason (Clackmannan and Kinross) 19
Mr. Gretton (Derbyshire, S.) 19
The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 20
Mr. Hemphill (Tyrone, N.) 22
Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green) 22
Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) 23
Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.) 24

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 120; Noes, 16. (Division List No. 17.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc."—(*Sir Brampton Gurdon.*)

Major Jameson 25

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 118; Noes, 13. (Division List No. 18.)

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturdays (Ireland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Sloan (*Belfast, S.*) 27
Mr. O'Shaughnessy (*Limerick, W.*) 32

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Nannetti (*Dublin, College Green*) 35
Major Jameson (*Clare, W.*) 41

Amendment proposed,

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Nannetti.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. T. W. Russell (*Tyrone, S.*) 43
Mr. William Redmond (*Clare, E.*) 46
The Solicitor General (*Sir E. Carson, Oxford University*) 49
Mr. Haviland Burke (*King's County, Tullamore*) 49
Mr. Flavin (*Kerry, N.*) 52

Colonel Saunderson (Armagh, N.) rose in his place and claimed to move that the Question be now put.

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 106; Noes, 77. (Division List No. 19.)

Question put accordingly, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House divided:—Ayes, 103; Noes, 79. (Division List No. 20.)

Mr. Sloan claimed, "That the Main Question be now put."

Main Question put accordingly, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

The House divided:—Ayes, 101; Noes, 76. (Division List No. 21.)

Bill read a second time and committed for Monday next.

STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMAN'S PANEL).

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON reported from the Chairman's Panel: That they had appointed Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON further reported from the Chairman's Panel: That they had agreed to the following Resolution: That any Member of the Chairman's panel be and he is hereby empowered to ask any other Member of the Chairman's panel to take his place in case of necessity.

Report to lie upon the Table 59

Adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—

Hamilton, Motherwell, and Wishaw Tramways [H.L.]. The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Electric Lighting (London) Bill [H.L.], referred to the Examiners.

Birmingham District Tramways Bill [H.L.]. Order for the meeting of the Standing Orders Committee on Thursday next, discharged.

Birmingham Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Brighton Corporation Bill [H.L.]; King's College, London, Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Bill [H.L.], Reports from His Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the table.

Didcot, Newbury, and Southampton Railway Bill [H.L.]; Harrow and Stanmore Gas Bill [H.L.]; Taff Vale Railway Bill [H.L.]; London and North-Western Railway Bill [H.L.]; North's Navigation Collieries Bill [H.L.], read 2ª.

Birmingham Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Brighton Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Exeter Corporation Bill [H.L.]; King's College (London) Bill [H.L.], read 2ª (according to order).

Antrim, Down, Armagh, and Belfast Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Aston Manor Improvement Bill [H.L.]; Belfast Water Bill [H.L.]; Bournemouth Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Bristol Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Bury and District Joint Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Carmarthenshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Chard Corporation Gas and Electricity Bill [H.L.]; Frinton-on-Sea Sea Defences Bill [H.L.]; Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill [H.L.]; Nantwich Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; North-Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill [H.L.]; committed; The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Oldham Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Rochester Corporation Tramways and Improvements Bill [H.L.]; Salford Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Scunthorpe Urban District Water Bill [H.L.];

Mar. 9.] *Page*

Shropshire, Worcestershire, and East Denbighshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Southampton Harbour Bill [H.L.]; Sutton Coldfield Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Torquay Corporation Water Bill [H.L.]; Willesden Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Worthing Corporation (Tramways) Bill [H.L.]; committed; The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Harrogate Water Bill [H.L.]; Hastings Harbour Bill; committed 61

PETITIONS.

SHOPS (EARLY CLOSING) BILL [H.L.]—Petitions in favour of: of Traders' Defence Association of Scotland; and Glasgow Municipal Debating Society; read, and ordered to lie on the Table... 62

BANGOR DIOCESE.—Petitions in favour of restoration of patronage of certain benefices to the Bishop of Bangor: of clergymen in the rural deaneries of Twrcelyn; Archllechwedd; Talybolion; Eifionydd; Tyndaethway; Menai; Arwystli; Arvon; Maltraeth; Lleyn; Cyfeiliog Mawddwy; and Estimaur; read, and ordered to lie on the Table... 62

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NATAL.—Ordered that the Order of Monday last that the "Northern Districts Annexation Act, 1902," do lie on the Table, be discharged... 62

LIGHT LOAD LINE.—The evidence taken before the Select Committee from time to time to be printed, but no copies to be delivered except to members of the Committee, and to such other persons as the Committee shall think fit, until further order 62

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Lists of public elementary schools and training colleges under the administration of the Board, 1902-1903.... 62

ARMY ESTIMATES.—Abstract of Army Estimates, 1903–1904 (ordinary services only) compared with corresponding figures for 1902–1903 63

NAVAL RESERVES.—Report of the Naval Reserves Committee; with appendices 63

SEWAGE DISPOSAL (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Third Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire and report what methods of treating and disposing of sewage may properly be adopted, together with Minutes of Evidence, Vols. I. and II.. 63

EMIGRATION STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Report and tables for the year 1902 ... 63

CHURCH ESTATES COMMISSION.—Fifty-second Report from the Church Estates Commissioners, for the year preceding 1st March, 1903.
Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table 63

CHURCH TEMPORALITIES (IRELAND).—Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General upon the account of the Irish Land Commission in respect of Church Temporalities in Ireland, for the year ended 31st March, 1902, together with the account for the above period and that from 26th July, 1869 (the date of the Irish Church Act), to 31st March, 1902 63

BUILDING SOCIETIES.—Eighth Annual Report by the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies of the Proceedings of the Registrars under the Building Societies Acts; with an abstract of the Annual Accounts and Statements of Societies for the year 1902. Part I. Report.
Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 63

INTRUSIVE PATRONAGE IN NORTH WALES.

Lord Stanley of Alderley 63
Earl Stanhope 74

Registration of Land Writs in Scotland Bill.

The Secretary for Scotland (*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*) 77

On Question Bill read 1ª. To be printed. [No. 1.]

PENSIONS FOR MASTER MARINERS.

Lord Muskerry 77
Lord Wolverton 77

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

A POINT OF ORDER.

Sir E. Durning-Lawrence (*Cornwall, Truro*) 78
Mr. Speaker 79

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz. :—

Great Eastern Railway (No. 1) Bill; Great Eastern Railway (No. 2) Bill. Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

Bridgwater Gas Bill; Broadstairs Gas Bill; Commercial Gas Bill; Coventry Electric Tramways Bill; Crystal Palace District Gas Bill; East Ardsley Gas Bill; Gorleston and Southtown Gas Bill; Great Northern Railway Bill; Great Western Railway (Pension Fund) Bill; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Ipswich Gas Bill; London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill; Maidstone Gas Bill; Midland Railway Bill; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill; North Middlesex Gas Bill; Scarborough Gas Bill; Sittingbourne District Gas Bill; Sutton District Water Bill; Walker and Wallsend Union Gas Bill; Winchester Water and Gas Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Wood Green Urban District Council Bill. [By Order] Read a second time, and committed 79

PETITIONS.

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Peebles; Kinnaird; Langholm; Dunisdeer; Tynron; Dunblane; Balmaclellan; Birsay; Caddonfoot; Cairney; Carsphairn; Cluny; Burness;

Mar. 9.] *Page*

Dalton; Durris; Elie; Gairloch; Glasgow; Wigtown; Kildrummy; Kiltarlity; Kincardine O'Neil; Lady; Leuchars; Markinch; Melrose; Minnigaff; Minto; Mochrum; Moulin; New Deer; Penninghame; Polwarth; Roxburgh; Strichen; St. Fergus; Stow; Tannadice; Tough; Tundergarth; and Whithorn; to lie upon the Table 80

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE.—Petition from Bradford, for extension to Women; to lie upon the Table 80

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.—Petitions against: from Sheffield; Gateshead; and Canterbury; to lie upon the Table 80

BRITISH MUSEUM.—Petition [presented 26th February] referred to the Committee of Supply 80

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY ESTIMATES (ABSTRACT).—Copy presented, of Abstract of Army Estimates, 1903–4 (Ordinary Services only), compared with corresponding Figures for 1902–3 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 80

CHURCH ESTATES COMMISSION.—Copy presented, of Fifty-second Report from the Church Estates Commissioners for the year preceding 1st March, 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 80

SEWAGE DISPOSAL (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Copy presented, of Third Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire and report what methods of Treating and Disposing of Sewage may properly be adopted, together with Minutes of Evidence, Vols. I. and II. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 81

EMIGRATION STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Emigration Statistics of Ireland for the year 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 81

BOARD OF EDUCATION (PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, ETC.).—Copy presented, of Lists of Public Elementary Schools and Training Colleges under the Administration of the Board, 1902–3 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 81

NAVAL RESERVES.—Copy presented, of Report of the Naval Reserves Committee, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 81

Papers laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House:—

CHURCH TEMPORALITIES (IRELAND).—Copy of Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General upon the account of the Irish Land Commission in respect of Church Temporalities in Ireland for the year ended 31st March, 1902 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 64] 81

BUILDING SOCIETIES.—Copy of Eighth Annual Report by the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies of the proceedings of the Registrars under the Building Societies Acts, etc. [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 65] 81

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS FUNDS.—Return ordered, "showing the amounts and values of Government Stock, Bills and Bonds, Annuities, and other securities standing in the names of the National Debt Commissioners on account of the Post Office Savings Banks Fund on 31st December, 1902; together with any dividends accrued but not received up to such date."—(*Mr. Channing*) 81

PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (CONTRIBUTIONS BY GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS).—Return ordered, "of the number of Public Elementary Schools, classified into Board, Church of England, Wesleyan, Roman Catholic, British, and other Undenominational Schools, which have received for the years 1900–1901, 1901–1902 (1) Annual Grants, (2) Contributions from the Commissioners of Woods and Forests or any other Government Department not being the Board of Education, together with the total sum in each case given to each class of school."—(*Mr. Trevelyan*) 82

ADVERTISEMENTS (FOREIGN COUNTRIES).—Address for "Return of the laws, if any, in force in France, Germany, Austria, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and the United States: (1) for regulating or restricting the exhibition of posters, bills, and other public advertisements; and (2) for the taxation of such advertisements."—(*Mr. Bryce*) 82

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

TREATMENT OF PERSONS CONVICTED UNDER THE VACCINATION ACTS.—Question, Mr. Levy (Leicestershire, Loughborough); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 82

NEW NAVAL BASE—CLAIMS OF THE TYNE.—Question, Mr. Plummer (Newcastle-on-Tyne); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 83

CARRIAGE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE IN DENMARK—SUBSIDIES TO STEAMERS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Lord Cranborne ... 83

UGANDA RAILWAY—MATERIAL—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Lord Cranborne 84

COTTON CLOTHS FACTORIES ACT.—Question, Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 84

COST OF MILITARY AID TO CIVIL POWER—SUGGESTED LEGISLATION.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas ... 84

MUSICAL COPYRIGHT.—Question, Mr. Joseph Walton (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley); Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 85

LAND TRANSFER ACT—REGISTRATION OF TITLES.—Question, Mr. Remnant (Finsbury, Holborn); Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 85

GRIEVANCES OF CUSTOMS' ASSISTANT CLERKS.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 85

EDUCATION ACT—SCHEMES FOR APPROVAL.—Question, Mr. Whitley (Halifax); Answer, Sir Wm. Anson 86

ADEN—CONDITION OF BARRACKS.—Question, Mr. Orr-Ewing (Ayr Burghs); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 86

LICENSING IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 87

TRAWLERS IN THE MORAY FIRTH.—Question, Mr. Bignold (Wick Burghs); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 87

IMPRISONMENT OF A SEAMAN—CASE OF R. MOORE.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 87

Mar. 9.] *Page*

H.M.S. "GOOD HOPE"—SPEED AND COAL CONSUMPTION.—Question, Sir William Allan (Gateshead); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 88

TENDERS FOR THE "ENCHANTRESS."—Question, Sir William Allan (Gateshead) Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 89

NAVY—PROMOTIONS OF WARRANT OFFICERS TO LIEUTENANTS.—Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 89

BRAUNTON (NORTH DEVON) LIGHTHOUSE.—Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 90

IRISH LIGHTS BOARD.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 90

IRELAND—WORKING MEN AS JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 91

LOUGHREA (GALWAY) LOAN FUND.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 91

URBAN DISTRICTS (IRELAND) RETURN.—Question, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 91

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES AT DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 92

IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS—REPAIRS TO SCHOOLS AND RESIDENCES.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 93

IRISH LAND CONFERENCE—PAPERS.—Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 93

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOLS—ASSISTANT TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 93

RESERVISTS IN RECEIPT OF RESERVE PAY.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 93

STRENGTH OF THE ARMY—MILITIA AND VOLUNTEER STAFFS.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 94

ARMY—GENERAL ANNUAL RETURN.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 94

SOLDIERS' CLUB AT MALTA.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 95

AFFAIRS IN MACEDONIA—MEMORANDA OF MADAME BAKHEMETIEFF.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 95

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

ARMY CORPS MANŒUVRES.—Question, Mr. Malcolm (Suffolk, Stowmarket); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 95

ARMY RETURNS.—Question, Mr. Winston Churchill (Oldham); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 96

Mar. 9.] Page

BRITISH CAMPAIGNS AND EXPEDITIONS.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 96

ARMY BUILDINGS ON SALISBURY PLAIN. Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 96

OFFICERS' EXPENSES.—Question, Mr. Powell-Williams (Birmingham, S.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 97

STRENGTH OF THE ARMY.—Questions, Col. Welby (Taunton); Mr. Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Fareham); and Mr. Goulding (Wiltshire, Devizes); Answers, Mr. Brodrick 97

RECRUITING—HOW NUMBER ARE MADE UP.—Questions, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); and Mr. Charles Hobhouse; Answers, Mr. Brodrick 98

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.—Lord Roberts and Lord Belhaven and Mr. Brodrick... 99

FIELD ARTILLERY BATTERIES AT LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 100

PORTSMOUTH HARBOUR.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) ... 100

BOER PRISONERS IN INDIA.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answers, The Under Secretary of State for India (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.); and the Postmaster-General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 101

TRANSVAAL MINES—EMPLOYMENT OF NATIVES.—Question, Mr. Trevelyan, (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 102

CHINA—BRITISH RAILWAY CONCESSIONS.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 102

CHINA—WUCHANG VICEROY. Question, Mr. Joseph Walton (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley); Answer, Lord Cranborne... 103

ST. LOUIS EXPOSITION. Questions, Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs); Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); and Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.); Answers, Lord Cranborne 103

BRITISH AND RUSSIAN INFLUENCES IN PERSIA.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Lord Cranborne 104

CHINESE ANTI-FOREIGN FEELING.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Lord Cranborne 105

ARGENTINE FINANCE—CONSULAR REPORT.—Question, Mr. Rose (Cambridgeshire, Newmarket); Answer, Lord Cranborne 105

SCOTCH WHISKEY.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir M. Hicks-Beach, Bristol, W.) 106

DEATH DUTIES ON LICENSED PROPERTIES.—Question, Sir W. Hart-Dyke (Kent, Dartford); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 107

Brussels Sugar Convention—Views of British Colonies and India.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 107

Manchester Post Office — Head Postmen. — Question, Mr. Schwann; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 108

Alien Criminals.—Question, Mr. Powell Williams; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 108

London and Globe Finance Corporation.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, Southmolton); Answer, The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 108

Scottish Licensing Law.—Question, Mr. Parker Smith (Lanarkshire, Partick); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire)... ... 109

Customs Boatmen's Grievances.—Question, Mr. Harry Samuel (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hayes Fisher, Fulham) 109

Seed Potatoes for Ireland. — Question, Mr. Mansfield (Lincolnshire, Spalding); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 110

Inspection of Irish Intermediate Schools.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, Mr. Wyndham) 110

Swinford Seed Loan.—Question, Mr. O'Kelly (Mayo, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 111

Irish School Teachers—New Rules and Salaries.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 111

Land Purchase in Leitrim—Gillmor's Case.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 112

Roxboro Road Schools, Limerick. — Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 112

Buncrana and Cardonagh Railway.—Question, Mr. M'Fadden (Donegal, E.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 113

Limerick Postal and Telegraph Staff's Grievances.—Question, Mr. Joyce; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 113

Limerick Post Office—Assistant Superintendentship.—Question, Mr. Joyce; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 113

The Budget.—Question, Sir George Bartley (Islington, N.); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.)... 114

NEW BILLS.

Bankruptcy Act (1883) Amendment Bill.—"To amend The Bankruptcy Act, 1883," presented by Mr Brynmor Jones; supported by Mr. McKenna, Mr. Price, and Mr. Harry Samuel; to be read a second time upon Friday, 24th April, and to be printed. [Bill 86.] 114

Foreigners' Marriages Bill.—"For the better safeguarding of British subjects in their intermarriage with Foreigners," presented by Mr. Macdona; supported by Mr. Talbot, Mr. Rothschild, Sir Joseph Dimsdale, Mr. Churchill, Lord Hugh Cecil, Captain Norton, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Samuel Evans, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Stuart Samuel, and Mr. Heywood Johnstone; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 87.] 114

Poor Law Superannuation (Ireland) Bill.—"To provide for Superannuation allowances to certain local officers and servants in Ireland, for contributions towards such allowances by such officers and servants, and to make other relative provisions," presented by Mr. Joyce; supported by Sir James Haslett, Mr. O'Malley, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Cogan, and Mr. T. W. Russell; to be read a second time upon Monday, 23rd March, and to be printed. [Bill 88.] 115

Local Government Franchise and Repesentation (Extension to Companies) Bill.—"For extending Local Government Franchises and Representation to certain Corporations and to Joint Stock and other Companies," presented by Sir Albert Rollit; supported by Sir Fortescue Flannery, Mr. H. C. Richards, Sir William Holland, and Mr. Howard; to be read a second time upon Friday, and to be printed. [Bill 89.] 115

SUPPLY (ARMY ESTIMATES).—Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Colonel Long (Worcestershire, Evesham) 115
Mr. Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Fareham) 122

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'in the opinion of this House, the altered conditions of modern warfare render necessary radical changes in the system of professional training of the officers and men of our Army and Auxiliary Forces, which proved inadequate during the late war' instead thereof."—(*Colonel Long.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Sir Arthur Hayter (Walsall) 128
The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) ... 132
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 145
Major Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford) 149
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 150
Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping) 155
Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.) 158
Mr. Llewellyn (Somersetshire, N.) 161
Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire) 162
Sir James Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.) 165
Mr. Courtney Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 168
Colonel Sandys (Lancashire, Bootle) 172
Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs) 173
Colonel Blundell (Lancashire, Ince) 174
Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.) 175
Colonel Pilkington (Lancashire, Newton) 176

Question put, and agreed to.

Mar. 9.] *Page*

Main Question again proposed.

Debate arising.

VOLUNTEER ORGANISATION.

Mr. Lambton (Durham, S.E.) 177
Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) 186

And, it being half-past Seven of the Clock, the Debate stood adjourned till This Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY (ARMY ESTIMATES).—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on main question [9th March], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Main Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

Sir Gilbert Parker... 190
Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central) 199
Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.) 206
The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 209
Mr. Parker Smith (Lanarkshire, Partick)... 214
Colonel Pilkington (Lancashire, Newton) 217
Mr. Llewellyn 220
Mr. Duke (Plymouth) 220
Mr. Renwick (Newcastle-on-Tyne) 223
Mr. Brodrick 228
Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) 232
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 235

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Lough.*)

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 235
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 235

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

Local Government (Transfer of Powers) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid) 236

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

Adjourned at Two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

Page

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 10th MARCH, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:

Scottish American Mortgage Company, Limited [H.L.]; Hastings Harbour District Railway [H.L.]. The same were ordered to lie on the Table... 237

Bradford Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Read 2ª (according to order).

Old Bridewell Burying Ground Bill [H.L.]; Somerset and District Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Rickmansworth Gas Bill [H.L.]. Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 237

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Queen Anne's Bounty.—Annual Report and Accounts of the Governors, for the year ended 31st December, 1902. Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table 237

Education (Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889).—Report of the Board of Education on the administration of schools, under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 237

Prevention of Corruption Bill [H.L].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor (The Earl of Halsbury) 237

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord Burghclere 241
Lord Tweedmouth 241
Lord Alverstone 242

On Question, agreed to; Bill read 2ª accordingly and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

The 1st Battalion Grenadier Guards.

The Duke of Bedford 243
The Under Secretary of State for War (The Earl of Hardwicke) ... 244
The Duke of Bedford 245
The Earl of Hardwicke ... 247
Lord Belhaven 248
Earl Roberts 250

House adjourned at Twenty minutes past Five o'clock, to Thursday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 10th MARCH, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

The Chairman of Ways and Means.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means ... 251

Mar. 10.] *Page*

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Burgess Hill and St. John's Common Gas Bill; Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill; Fishguard and Rosslare Railways and Harbours Bill; Watford and Edgware Railway Bill [by Order]; Great Northern and City Railway Bill [by Order]; Hampton Court Gas Bill [by Order]; Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Bill [by Order].—Read a second time, and committed 251

Standing Orders.—Resolutions reported from the Committee—

1. "That, in the Case of the Metropolitan District Railway (Various Powers) Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Railway No. 1 be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

2. "That, in the case of the Wigan Corporation Tramways Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 2 and 4 be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

3. "That, in the case of the London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 8, 8a, 9, and 9a be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

4. "That in the case of the Strabane and Letterkenny Railway Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

5. "That, in the case of the Sheffield Corporation Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 2 and 2a be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

6. "That, in the case of the Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1 and 2 be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

7. "That, in the case of the Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers contained in Clause 62 of the Bill, authorising the Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Company and the Great Northern Railway Company (Ireland) to subscribe to the undertaking, be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

8. "That, in the case of the Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway (*Substituted Bill*) Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that Clauses 28 and 29 be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

9. "That, in the case of the Croydon and District Electric Tramways Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 13a, 13b, 14, 15, and 16 be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

Resolutions agreed to 252

Mar. 10.] *Page*

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill.—Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. John Burns and Colonel Nolan ... 253

Strabane and Letterkenny Railway Bill.—Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Sergeant Hemphill, Mr. Hugh Law, and Mr. M'Fadden 253

PETITIONS.

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour; from Gordon; Cromarty; and Inverkeithing; to lie upon the Table 253

FRANCHISE AND REMOVAL OF WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL.—Petition from Hunslet, in favour; to lie upon the Table 253

LICENSING (SCOTLAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL, FOR ALTERATION, AND LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.—In favour: Petition from Paisley; to lie upon the Table 254

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.—Petitions against: from Tynemouth (two): Middlesbrough; and Newport Pagnell; to lie upon the Table 254

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Bracknell; Sidcup; Lee; Wimbledon; and Enfield; to lie upon the Table 254

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (WELSH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION ACT, 1889).—Copy presented, of Report of the Board of Education on the Administration of Schools, under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 66.] 254

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.—Copy presented, of Annual Report and Accounts of the Governors for the year 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 254

PUBLIC OFFICES (ACQUISITION OF SITE) ACT, 1895, SESSION 2; PUBLIC OFFICES (WESTMINSTER) SITE ACT, 1896; PUBLIC OFFICES (WHITEHALL) SITE ACT, 1897; AND PUBLIC BUILDING EXPENSES ACT, 1898.—Account presented, showing the moneys issued out of the Consolidated Fund, the moneys borrowed and the securities created in respect thereof, the disposal of moneys issued to the National Debt Commissioners for temporary investment, and the expenditure, under the provisions of the Acts, to the 31st March, 1902; together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 67.] 254

URBAN DISTRICTS (IRELAND).—Return ordered, "showing (1) the total rateable value of each of the urban districts in Ireland; (2) the borrowing powers of each, distinguishing between their powers under the Public Health (Ireland) Act and Local Acts (if any); (3) the amount borrowed by each Urban District on the security of the rates, distinguishing loans from (*a*) Local Loans Fund, (*b*) Stock, (*c*) other sources (exclusive of loans entirely repaid on the 1st day of January 1902); (4) the amount of loans repaid up to the 1st day of January 1902 (exclusive of loans entirely repaid on the 1st day of January 1902); (5) the rate in the pound for all purposes levied in each Urban District during the years 1899, 1900, and 1901, and (6) the income (if any) of each Urban District from sources other than the rates."—(*Mr. O'Shee.*)... 254

Mar. 10.] *Page*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

EDUCATION ACT, 1902—SCHOOL TRUST DEEDS.—Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.); Answer, Sir Wm. Anson 255

EXAMINATION OF IMPORTED MILK.—Question, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 255

ALIEN LUNATICS AT TILBURY DOCKS.—Question, Lieut.-Col. Tufnell (Essex, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 256

DELAY OF MAILS AT LERWICK, ETC.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answers, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 257

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK—PROMOTIONS.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 258

DISTRESS AT FOULA, SHETLAND.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 258

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

MANNING OF THE FLEET—COMMITTEE'S REPORT.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 259

BOY ARTIFICERS IN THE NAVY.—Question, Mr. Kearley (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 259

IMMIGRATION OF ALIENS.—Questions, Mr. Goulding (Wiltshire, Devizes) and Mr. James Lowther (Kent, Thanet); Answers, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 259

STEAM LAUNCHES "WASP" AND "COCKCHAFER."—Question, Mr. Kearley; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 261

POSTAL RATES TO THE UNITED STATES.—Question, Mr. Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Fareham); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 261

TELEGRAPHIC ERRORS—NO COMPENSATION.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 262

TRACTION ENGINES ON PUBLIC ROADS.—Questions, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.), and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 262

CLERKS TO JUSTICES—FEES FOR REGISTRATION OF CLUBS.—Question, Mr. Corrie Grant (Warwickshire, Rugby); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas ... 263

SMALL-POX IN LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE.—Questions, Sir Joseph Leese (Lancashire, Accrington), and Mr. Coghill (Stoke-upon-Trent); Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S) 264

ALIEN PAUPERS.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 265

HIGH PAVEMENT BOARD SCHOOL, NOTTINGHAM.—Question, Mr. Corrie Grant; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 265

Mar. 10.] *Page*

LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN CO. LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) ... 266

IRISH TRAINING COLLEGES.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 266

IRISH COURT OF CONSCIENCE.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 267

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford), and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 267

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Mr. Halsey reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had added to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, the following fifteen Members in respect of the Innkeepers' Liability Bill:—Mr. Bousfield, Mr. Broadhurst, Sir John Brunner, Mr. Vicary Gibbs, Mr. Goulding, Mr. Gretton, Sir Brampton Gurdon, Mr. Guthrie, Mr. Levy, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Chas. Seely, Mr. Crawford Smith, Colonel Walker, Mr. Eugene Wason, and Mr. Patrick White.

Report to lie upon the Table 268

NEW BILLS.

Housing of the Working Classes Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to the Housing of the Working Classes, and to establish fair rent courts," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. John Burns, Mr. Bell, Mr. Cremer, Captain Norton, Dr. Shipman, Mr. George White, and Mr. Stuart Samuel; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 2nd April, and to be printed. [Bill 90.] 268

Tied Houses (Freeing) Bill.—"To secure freedom for holders of licences for the sale of intoxicating liquor," presented by Mr. Rea; supported by Mr. Thomson, Mr. Yoxall, Mr. J. H. Whitley, Mr. Layland-Barratt, Mr. Bell, Mr. Soares, and Mr. Rigg; to be read a second time upon Friday, 3rd April, and to be printed. [Bill 91.] 268

Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill.—"To amend the Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Acts," presented by Sir Henry Seton-Karr; supported by Sir William Tomlinson, Mr. Atherley-Jones, Colonel Nolan, Colonel Saunderson, and Mr. Yerburgh; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, March 31st, and to be printed. [Bill 92.]... 268

Lands Valuation (Scotland) Bill.—"To amend The Lands Valuation (Scotland) Act, 1854," presented by Mr. McCrae; supported by Mr. Bryce, Sir John Leng, Sir William Dunn, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. John Dewar, and Dr. Robert Wallace; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 5th May, and to be printed. [Bill 93.] 268

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Committee of Public Accounts do consist of Fifteen Members."—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 269

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That the Committee of Public Accounts do consist of Fifteen Members.

SUPPLY (ARMY ESTIMATES).—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question (9th March), "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for Committee on Army Estimates, 1903–4."

Question again proposed:

Debate resumed.

Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 270
Mr. Wylie (Dumbartonshire) 276
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 283
Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) 291
Sir Robert Reid (Dumfries Burghs) 292
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 293

Question put, and agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Number of Land Forces, not exceeding 235,761, all ranks, be maintained for the Service of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland at Home and Abroad, excluding His Majesty's Indian Possessions, during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) ... 294
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 314
Mr. Guest (Plymouth) 319

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a number of Land Forces, not exceeding 208,751, be maintained for the said Service."—*Mr. Guest.*

Debate arising.

Major Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) 330
Mr. Emmott (Oldham) 336
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) 342
Sir J. Stirling Maxwell (Glasgow, College) 345
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 347
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 347

It being half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee Report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

WALES (NATIONAL MUSEUM GRANT).

Mr. William Jones (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) 350
Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs) 353

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to make provision, similar to that made for Scotland and Ireland, for a National Museum in Wales."—(*Mr. William Jones.*)

Major Wyndham Quin (*Glamorganshire, S.*) 355
The Secretary to the Board of Education (*Sir Wm. Anson, Oxford University*) 355
Sir Alfred Thomas (*Glamorganshire, E.*) 358
Sir Joseph Lawrence (*Monmouth Boroughs*) 358
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. Hayes Fisher, Fulham*) ... 359
Mr. Lloyd George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 363

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Bank Holidays (Ireland) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Sir FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) in the Chair.]

On Clause I.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 5, after '1871' insert 'and the Holidays Extension Act, 1875.'"—(*Mr. Atkinson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"To insert in line 7 after 'week-day' the following words: 'and if a Sunday, the next day following.'"—(*Mr. O'Mara.*)

Amendment agreed to.

The House resumed, and the Bill as amended was reported, to be considered to-morrow.

Public Houses (Hours of Closing (Scotland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir John Leng (*Dundee*) 367

Notice taken that forty Members were not present; House counted, and forty Members not being present,

The House was adjourned at half an hour after Ten of the Clock till to-morrow.

Adjourned at half after Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, 11TH MARCH, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means ... 369

Mar. 11.] *Page*

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Blackheath and Greenwich District Electric Light Bill; London Hydraulic Power Bill; Market Drayton Gas Bill.—Read a second time and committed 369

STANDING ORDERS.—Ordered, that Dr. Farquharson be discharged from the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

Ordered, that Mr. Buchanan be added to the Committee.—(*Mr. John Ellis*) 369

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill.—"To enable the London County Council to construct and work tramways in the county of London; to make street improvements; and to acquire and use lands for the purposes of a station or stations for generating electric energy: to empower the Council of the metropolitan borough of Woolwich to widen and improve Well Hall Road; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time 369

Strabane and Letterkenny Railway Bill.—"To authorise the construction of railways in the counties of Tyrone and Donegal between Strabane and Letterkenny; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 369

WIGAN CORPORATION TRAMWAYS.—Report [10th March] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Francis Powell and Lord Balcarres ... 369

HARROW ROAD AND PADDINGTON TRAMWAYS.—Report [10th March] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Atherley-Jones, Sir Ernest Spencer, and Mr. Bigwood 370

CROYDON AND DISTRICT ELECTRIC TRAMWAYS.—Report [10th March] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Guthrie and Major Seely 370

SHEFFIELD CORPORATION.—Report [10th March] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Stuart-Wortley and Mr. Batty Langley 370

LANARKSHIRE AND DUMBARTONSHIRE RAILWAY.—Report [10th March] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be be brought in by Mr. Wylie and Colonel Denny ... 370

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT RAILWAY (VARIOUS POWERS).—Report [10th March] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Perks and Sir Charles Dalrymple ... 370

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill.—Report [10th March] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill to be read a second time 370

Beckenham Urban District Council Bill.—Petition for additional Provision: referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 370

Mar. 11.] *Page*

PETITIONS.

County Courts Jurisdiction Extension Bill.—Petitions in favour: from Leeds; Devon and Exeter; Chester and North Wales; and Birmingham; to lie upon the Table 370

Detention of Poor Persons (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions in favour: from Portpatrick; Eddrachillis; Stoneykirk; Auldearn; Stranraer; Dunsyre; and Biggar; to lie upon the Table 371

Destitute Adult Blind.—Petition from Leith, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 371

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill.—Petition from Mawdsley, in favour; to lie upon the Table 371

Rating of Machinery Bill.—Petitions against: from Newport (Mon.); Haworth; Gateshead; Exeter; Isle of Thanet; and Wallsend; to lie upon the Table 371

Vagrants (Compulsory Vaccination and Re-Vaccination).—Petition from Congleton, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 371

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Navy (Dockyard Expense Accounts, 1901-2).—Annual Accounts presented, for 1901–2, of Shipbuilding and Dockyard Transactions, etc., with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 68.] 371

Naval Works Acts, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1899, and 1901.—Account presented, showing the amount of money issued out of the Consolidated Fund; the amount and nature of the Securities created in respect thereof; the amount of the surplus of Income over Expenditure for the financial year ended 31st March, 1896, and the amount of money expended in pursuance of the Acts during the year ended the 31st March, 1902; together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 70.] 371

Navy (Victualling Yard Manufacturing Accounts, 1901–2).—Annual Accounts presented, of the cost of manufacturing, provisions, victualling stores, etc., at the Home Victualling Yards and Malta Yard for 1901–2, etc., with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 71.] 371

Army.—Copy presented, of officers compulsorily retired or dismissed the Service [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House—

Loan Societies.—Abstract of Accounts of Loan Societies in England and Wales to 31st December, 1901, furnished to the Central Office for the Registry of Friendly Societies [by Act] 372

Public Worship Regulation and Church Discipline.—Address for "Return of the number of the representations made to the bishop of every diocese in England and Wales under the eighth Section of the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, from the 31st day of December, 1898, up to the end of the year 1902; and also the number of cases in which the bishop to whom the representation was made was of opinion that proceedings should

Mar. 11.] *Page*

not be taken on the representation; and also for a copy in the last-mentioned cases of the representation, and of the statement deposited in the registry of the diocese showing the reason for the opinion of the bishop (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 212, of Session 1899)."—(*Mr. Heywood Johnstone.*) 372

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

CONSTRUCTION OF A BRIDGE AT APPLECROSS, ROSS-SHIRE.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 372

TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH WESTRAY, ORKNEY. — Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 373

PROMOTION IN DUBLIN POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 373

DUBLIN POST OFFICE—SORTERS' DUTIES.—Question, Mr. Nannetti; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 373

INDIA—PAY OF ROYAL ARMY MEDICAL CORPS.—Question, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 374

INCREASED CHARGE ON ARMY ESTIMATES.—Question, Sir Edgar Vincent (Exeter); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 374

PENSIONS TO NAVAL SCHOOLMASTERS.—Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 375

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

BOER PRISONERS AT CEYLON.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.), and Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answers, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 375

ARMY ESTIMATES—PAY OF EXCESS TROOPS.—Question, Mr. Malcolm (Suffolk, Stowmarket); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 377

OFFICERS' UNIFORMS.—Questions, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.), and Capt. Donelan (Cork, E.); Answers, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 378

H.M.S. "HANNIBAL"—OIL FUEL TRIALS.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 378

NEW ARMY RIFLE—ADOPTION BY ADMIRALTY.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 379

H.M.S. "RUSSELL."—Questions, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough), and Sir William Allan (Gateshead); Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster 379

ADEN HINTERLAND.—Questions, Mr. Charles Hobhouse, and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Lord George Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) 380

Mar. 11.] *Page*

UNITED STATES—IMMIGRATION OF ALIENS—Questions, Mr. Marshall Hall (Lancashire, Southport), and Mr. James Lowther (Kent, Thanet); Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 381

SLAVERY IN THE CONGO FREE STATE.—Questions, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.), and Mr. Mansfield (Lincolnshire, Spalding); Answers Lord Cranborne 381

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS—DISTRIBUTION OF WORK.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 382

BOY RECRUITS—CASE OF FRANK GLOVER.—Questions, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 382

THE LONDON AND GLOBE FINANCE CORPORATION PROSECUTION.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 383

ST. LOUIS EXPOSITION—WESTERN HIGHLANDS TWEED EXHIBITS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 383

ENNIS LABOURERS' COTTAGES SCHEME.—Question, Mr. William Redmond; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 384

ROXBOROUGH ROAD SCHOOL, LIMERICK.—Questions, Mr. Joyce (Limerick), and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 384

LAND PURCHASE IN COUNTY LEITRIM—GILLMOR'S LANDS.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer. Mr. Wyndham 385

CLADNAGERAGH PIER.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 386

RATHMINES POLICE RATE.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 386

LAND PURCHASE IN COUNTY WICKLOW.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 387

PHŒNIX PARK, DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 388

PROPOSED SOUTH CLYDE CANAL.—Question, Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 388

HOUSE OF COMMONS—HOUR OF MEETING—Questions, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central), and Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 388

PRIVATE BUSINESS.—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 389

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL.—Question, Mr. Channing; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 389

NATIONAL FOOD SUPPLY IN WAR TIME.—Question, Sir Henry Seton Karr (St. Helens); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 390

Mar. 11.] *Page*

STANDING COMMITTEES CHAIRMEN'S PANEL.—Sir James Fergusson reported from the Chairmen's Panel: That they had appointed Mr. John Edward Ellis to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures.

Report to lie upon the Table 390

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.—First Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 390

NEW BILL.

Outdoor Relief (Pensioners) Bill.—"To empower Boards of Guardians to grant Outdoor Relief to Pensioners of the Army and Navy," presented by Colonel Blundell; supported by General Laurie, Mr. Kearley, Mr. Parker Smith, Sir James Fergusson, Mr. George Ormsby-Gore, and Colonel Nolan; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 94.] 390

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir A. Acland-Hood (Somersetshire, Wellington) 390

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.—Sir Frederick Banbury, Mr. Blake, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Hayes Fisher, Mr. Goddard, Sir Brampton Gurdon, Sir Arthur Hayter, Mr. Herbert Lewis, Mr. Arthur Morton, Sir Robert Mowbray, Mr. Pym, Mr. Powell-Williams, and Mr. Yerburgh nominated Members of the Committee of Public Accounts.

Ordered that the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a number of Land Forces, not exceeding 235,761, all ranks, be maintained for the Service of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland at home and abroad, excluding His Majesty's Indian Possessions, during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a number of Land Forces, not exceeding 208,761, be maintained for the said Service."—(*Mr. Guest.*)

Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 392
Mr. Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Fareham) 403
Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W) 414
Lieut.-General Laurie (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) 419
The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) ... 422
Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) 428

Page
Sir Edgar Vincent (Exeter) 437
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 443
Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich) 461
Major Seely (Isle of Wight) 463
Col. Lockwood (Essex, Epping) 464
Major Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford) 465
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Brightside) 466

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 154 ; Noes, 245 (Division List No. 22.)

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Whereupon MR. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question, "That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Question, "That the number of Land Forces, not exceeding 235,761, all ranks, be maintained for the Service of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland at home and abroad, excluding His Majesty's Indian Possessions, during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1904," put accordingly and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

Committee to sit again To-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill [BY ORDER]. —Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) 471

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Claude Hay*).

Question proposed. "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. John Burns (Battersea) 472
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 474
Mr. Perks (Lincolnshire, Lough). 474
Mr. Remnant (Finsbury, Holborn) 474

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

City and South London Railway Bill [By Order]; Great Southern and Western Railway Bill [By Order]. Read a second time, and committed.

The Removal of Army Officers.

Mr. Pirie (*Aberdeen, N.*) 574
Col. Welby (*Taunton*) 482

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, praying that where any officer is removed or retired from the Army, or placed on half-pay, for some specific act or omission concerning which a charge can be framed under the Army Act, His Majesty may be graciously pleased to direct that an option may be given to such officers of having their cases heard and adjudicated upon by Court-martial."—(*Mr. Pirie.*)

Mr. Bromley Davenport (*Cheshire, Macclesfield*) 487
The Secretary of State for War (*Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford*) ... 495
Mr. Winston Churchill (*Oldham*) 509
Col. Kenyon-Slaney (*Shropshire, Newport*) 511

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 57; Noes, 185. (Division List No. 23.)

Bank Holidays (Ireland) Bill.—As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill read the third time, and passed.

The Whitaker Wright Case.—On the question that the House should adjourn,

Mr. Swift MacNeill 515
Mr. Akers Douglas... 515
Mr. William Redmond 516

Public Worship Regulation and Church Discipline.—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 11th March; *Mr. Heywood Johnstone*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 69.] 516

Adjourned at twenty-three minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 12th MARCH, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Standing Orders Committee.—Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the following Bills ought to be dispensed with, and the Bills allowed to proceed:—

Mid Yorkshire Tramways Bill [h.l.]; Derby Gas Bill [h.l.]; Shepshed Urban District Gas Bill [h.l.]; Preston and Horwich Tramways Bill [h.l.]; Chatham and District Light Railways Bill [h.l.]

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

South Staffordshire Tramways Bill [h.l.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 1a, and 1b be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Macclesfield and District Electric Tramways Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13A, 17, and 17A be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Gosport, Fareham, and Cosham Tramways Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the local and road authorities to the said tramways be proved before the Committee on the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

South Lancashire Tramways Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that Tramways Nos. 3 and 4 be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the Atherton Urban District to the said tramways be proved before the Committee on the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Hove, Worthing, and District Tramways Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, and 18 be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Tynemouth and District Tramways Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 1A, 1B, 2, 3, 4, 4A, 5, 5A, 5B, 6, and 7 be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Wakefield and District Tramways Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that Tramway No. 1 be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the Ardsley East and West District Council be proved before the Committee on the Bill.

Fife Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Barry Railway Bill [H.L.]; Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]; Hastings Tramways (Extensions) Bill [H.L.]; Hexham Gas Bill [H.L.]; London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill [H.L.]; Nantwich Gas Bill [H.L.]; South-Western and Isle of Wight Junction Railway Bill [H.L.]; Wellington (Salop) Gas Bill [H.L.]; British Gas Light Company (Norwich) Bill [H.L.]; Cleveland and Durham County Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Dudley, Stourbridge, and District Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Pelican and British Empire Life Office Bill [H.L.]; Plymouth and Stonehouse Gas Bill [H.L.]; Poole and District Electric Traction Bill [H.L.]; South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [H.L.]; Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Bill [H.L.]; Committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Bournemouth Gas and Water Bill [H.L.]; Exeter Railway Bill [H.L.]; Faversham Gas Bill [H.L.]; Knott End Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]; South Wales Mineral Railway Bill [H.L.]; Western Trust Bill [H.L.]; Wirral Railway Bill [H.L.]; Port Talbot Railway and Docks Bill [H.L.]; Queensland Investment and Land Mortgage Bill [H.L.]; Committed.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Manchester Southern Tramways (Cheshire) Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that the necessary consents of the local and road authorities to Tramways Nos. 1, 2, and 3 be proved before the Committee on the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Manchester Southern Tramways (Lancashire) Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that the necessary consents of the local and road authorities to Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 7, 8, and 9 be proved before the Committee on the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Croydon and District Electric Tramways Bill

ought to be dispensed with, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 6 to 16 inclusive be struck out of the Bill; and the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 4, 4A, 5, 5A, and 5B be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the Penge Urban District Council to those tramways be proved before the Committee on the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Lancashire and Dumbartonshire Railway Bill

ought to be dispensed with, provided that Clauses 28 and 29 be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Bill

ought to be dispensed with, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1 and 2 be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Sheffield Corporation Bill

ought to be dispensed with, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 2 and 2A be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Metropolitan District Railway (Various Powers) Bill

ought to be dispensed with, provided that the powers to construct Railway No. 1 be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Wigan Corporation Tramways Bill

ought to be dispensed with, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 2 and 4 be struck out of the Bill.

Mar. 12.] *Page*

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the
London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill
ought to be dispensed with, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 8, 8A, 9, and 9A be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the
Strabane and Letterkenny Railway Bill
ought to be dispensed with.

Read and agreed to.

Scottish American Mortgage Company, Limited, Bill [H.L.]; Hastings Harbour District Railway Bill [H.L.]; Read 2ª.

Chard Corporation Gas and Electricity Bill [H.L.]; Plymouth and Stonehouse Gas Bill [H.L.]; Hexham Gas Bill [H.L.]; British Gas Light Company (Norwich) Bill [H.L.]; Nantwich Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Nantwich Gas Bill [H.L.]; Old Bridewell Burying Ground Bill [H.L.]; Cleveland and Durham County Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill [H.L.]; Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills, viz.:

E. Northesk,
E. Dartrey (Chairman),
L. Saltoun,
L. Lilford,
L. Carew;

Agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Thursday next at eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills 517

London County Asylum (Receiving Houses) Bill [H.L.]—SECOND READING.—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Monkswell 521
The Chairman of Committees (The Earl of Morley) 522
The Lord Chancellor (The Earl of Halsbury) 523

Order for the Second Reading discharged.

Bill, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

PETITION.

SHOPS (EARLY CLOSING) BILL [H.L.]—Petition in favour of: of shop assistants of Great Britain and Ireland; read, and ordered to lie on the Table ... 524

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY.—Officers compulsorily retired or dismissed the Service 524

TRADE REPORTS.—Annual Series, No. 2942. United States (New Orleans and District) 524

Mar. 12.] *Page*

MISCELLANEOUS, No. 1. (1903).—Reports on the laws of marriage and divorce in foreign countries (in continuation of Miscellaneous, No. 2, 1894).

Presented [by Command] and ordered to lie on the Table 524

LOAN SOCIETIES.—Abstract of accounts of Loan Societies in England and Wales, furnished to the Central Office, for the Registry of Friendly Societies, for the year ended 31st December, 1901: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 524

NEW BILLS.

Shop Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to amend the Law relating to shops—Was presented by the Lord Sudeley (*E. Arran*); read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 12.) ... 524

Bank Holidays (Ireland) Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 13.) 524

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION FOR THE STANDING COMMITTEE.—Report from, That the Committee have nominated the following Lords to serve on the Standing Committee:—

L. Archbishop of Canterbury.
E. Halsbury (*L. Chancellor*).
L. Archbishop of York.
D. Devonshire (*L. President*).
D. Bedford.
D. Northumberland.
D. Argyll.
M. Lansdowne.
M. Salisbury.
M. Bath.
E. Clarendon (*L. Chamberlain*).
E. Derby.
E. Denbigh.
E. Stamford.
E. Chesterfield.
E. Shaftesbury.
E. Jersey.
E. Lauderdale.
E. Carnwath.
E. Stanhope.
E. Waldegrave.
E. Portsmouth.
E. Hardwicke.
E. Spencer.
E. Mansfield.
E. Malmesbury.
E. Westmeath.
E. Onslow.
E. Grey.
E. Morley.
E. Beauchamp.
E. Vane (*M. Londonderry*).
E. Cawdor.
E. Camperdown.
E. Yarborough.
E. Innes (*D. Roxburghe*).
E. Dartrey.
E. Northbrook.
E. Lytton.
E. Selborne.
E. Ancaster.
L. Crewe.
L. Tweedmouth.
L. Northbourne.
L. Herries.
L. Monkswell.
L. Ashbourne.
L. Brassey.
L. Thring.
L. Macnaghten.
L. Ashcombe.
L. Newton.
L. Hawkesbury.
L. Stanmore.
L. Welby.
L. Davey.
V. Falkland.
V. Sidmouth.
V. Gordon (*E. Aberdeen*).
V. Hampden.
V. Cross.
V. Knutsford.
V. Llandaff.
V. Goschen.
V. Ridley.
V. Churchill.
L. Bishop of London.
L. Bishop of Hereford.
L. Bishop of Rochester.
L. Zouche of Haryngworth.
L. Windsor.
L. Clifford of Chudleigh.
L. Barnard.
L. Saltoun.
L. Balfour.
L. Boyle (*E. Cork and Orrery*)

L. Stewart of Garlies (*E. Galloway*).
L. Ribblesdale.
L. Harris.
L. Rosebery (*E. Rosebery*).
L. Poltimore.
L. Denman.
L. Kintore (*E. Kintore*).
L. Leigh.
L. Elgin (*E. Elgin and Kincardine*).
L. Belper.
L. Brougham and Vaux.
L. Kinnaird.
L. Lawrence.
L. Wolverton.
L. Sandhurst.
L. Aberdare.
L. Reay.
L. Burghclere.
L. James.
L. Heneage.
L. Coleridge.
L. Fermanagh (*E. Erne*).
L. Norton.
L. Lamington.
L. Rowton.
L. Ludlow.
L. Glanusk.
L. Avebury.
L. Alverstone.
L. Allerton.

Read, and ordered to lie on the Table 525

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House as the panel of Lords to act as Commissioners under the Act, viz. :—

E. Stamford,
L. Muncaster ;

Agreed to ; and the said Lords appointed accordingly 526

Shops (Hours of Closing) Bill [H.L.].—SECOND READING.—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Ribblesdale 526

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Ribblesdale.*)

The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 531

Moved, "That the debate on the Bill be now adjourned."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord Ribblesdale 533
Lord Tweedmouth 532
The Lord President of the Council (*The Duke of Devonshire*) 534

On Question, their Lordships divided :—Contents, 35 ; Not-Contents, 33.

Earl Spencer 535
Lord Tweedmouth 535

Moved, "That the House do now adjourn."—(*Lord Tweedmouth.*)

The Duke of Devonshire 536
The Earl of Rosebery 537
The Secretary for Scotland (*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*) 538
The Marquess of Ripon 539
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 539
The Earl of Camperdown 540
Lord Tweedmouth 540

Motion for the adjourment of the House (by leave) withdrawn.

Mar. 12.] *Page*

Shops (Early Closing) Bill [H.L.] [Second Reading].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Avebury 541

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Avebury.*)

Earl Spencer 546

Moved, "That the debate on the Bill be now adjourned."—(*Earl Spencer.*)

The Duke of Devonshire 546
The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 546
The Earl of Rosebery 548
Lord Tweedmouth 548
Earl Spencer 549

Motion (by leave of the House) withdrawn.

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 549
The Duke of Marlborough 550
Lord Belper 554
The Earl of Lytton... 556

On Question, agreed to; Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

House adjourned at half-past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 12TH MARCH, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

The Chairman of Ways and Means.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means ... 557

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Croydon and District Electric Tramways Bill.—"To authorise the British Electric Traction Company (Limited) to construct further Tramways in the counties of London, Surrey, and Kent; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills ... 557

Wigan Corporation Tramways Bill.—"To confer further powers upon the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Wigan in regard to the construction of tramways and street improvements; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time 557

Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Bill.—"To empower the Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Company to construct new tramways; to work their tramways by mechanical power; to lease their undertaking to the Metropolitan Electric Tramways, Limited; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 557

Sheffield Corporation Bill.—"To confer further powers on the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the city of Sheffield with respect to their water undertaking and their electrical undertaking; to authorise the construction of additional lines of tramways, and the execution of various street widenings and other works in the city; to consolidate into one township certain townships in the city; to make further and better provision for the improvement, health, and good government of the city; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time 558

Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway Bill.—"To authorise the Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway Company to raise further moneys; to enable the Caledonian Railway Company to subscribe for additional shares or stock; to sanction certain existing railways; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 558

Metropolitan District Railway (Various Powers) Bill.—"To empower the Metropolitan District Railway Company to deviate the railway authorised by The Metropolitan District Railway Act, 1897, and to construct other railways; to acquire lands; to lay down electric cables; to raise further capital; to acquire the Hounslow and Metropolitan Railway; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 558

PETITIONS.

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Hull; and Kent; to lie upon the Table 558

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Selkirk; and Lethnot; to lie upon the Table 558

LICENSING (SCOTLAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table 559

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.—Petitions against: from Stockton; Wickham; and Blaydon; to lie upon the Table 559

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2942 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 559

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE (FOREIGN COUNTRIES) (MISCELLANEOUS, No. 1, 1903).—Copy presented, of Reports on the laws on marriage and divorce in foreign countries (in continuation of Miscellaneous, No. 2, 1894) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 559

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House—

INQUIRY INTO CHARITIES (COUNTY OF LANCASHIRE).—Further Return relative thereto [ordered 8th August, 1898; *Mr. Grant Lawson*] to be printed. [No. 72.] 560

RAILWAYS, ETC., BILLS.—Return ordered, "of Report by the Board of Trade upon all the Railway, Canal, Tramway, Harbour and Tidal Waters, Electricity, Gas, and Water Bills, and Provisional Orders of Session 1903."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) 560

Mar. 12.] *Page*

MILITARY EXPEDITIONS.—Address for "Return of all Military Expeditions in which British or Native troops have been employed during the last ten years, in the following form :—

Year.	Expedition.	Troops employed.		Duration.	Cost.
		British.	Native.		

—(*Mr. Charles Hobhouse*) 560

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection : That they had added to the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice and Legal Procedure the following fifteen Members in respect of the Incest Bill : Colonel Blundell, Sir John Brunner, Mr. Burt, Mr. Charles Douglas, Sir Samuel Hoare, Mr. Joseph Howard, Sir John Kennaway, Colonel Lockwood, Mr. Nussey, Mr. Perks, Mr. Pym, Mr. Talbot, Mr. Tritton, Mr. George White, and Mr. Henry Joseph Wilson ... 559

Report to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

TRACTION ENGINES—ACCIDENTS IN LONDON STREETS.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.) ; Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 559

RIGHTS OF PROPERTY IN INDIA—RELIGIOUS DISABILITIES.—Question, Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.) ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton ... 561

ALLIED FORCES IN CHINA—INTERNATIONAL MEDAL.—Question, Mr. Kearley (Devonport) ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 562

EXCISE DUTIES ON INDIAN COTTON.—Question, Sir William Holland (Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham) ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 562

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AT MYDRIM, CARMARTHENSHIRE—PAYMENT OF GRANT. —Question, Mr. Lloyd-Morgan (Carmarthenshire, W.) ; Answer, Sir William Anson 562

CLEANING OF THE SERPENTINE.—Question, Mr. Bull (Hammersmith) ; Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 563

IMPROVED POSTAL FACILITIES AT DEVONPORT.—Question, Mr. Kearley ; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 563

LIVERPOOL POST OFFICE—SALARIES OF FEMALE STAFF.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny) ; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain ... 564

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT AND POSTAL SERVANTS.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien ; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 564

SUNDAY DELIVERY OF LETTERS IN KILKENNY.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien ; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 565

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FISHING RIGHTS.—Question, Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire) ; Answer, Lord Cranborne 565

Mar. 12.] *Page*

SURVEYORS OF TAXES—CLERICAL ASSISTANCE.—Question, Mr. Heywood Johnstone (Sussex, Horsham); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher... 566

ASSISTANT TEACHERS IN IRELAND—TEACHING OF IRISH.—Question, Mr. Crean (Cork, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 567

ERECTION OF LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN THE LISTOWEL UNION.—Question, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 567

IRELAND—LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUDITS—ST. PATRICK'S DAY.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 568

LABOURERS' (IRELAND) ACT—RETURN.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 568

MILITARY EDUCATION—PROMOTION OF NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS TO COMMISSIONED RANK.—Question, Mr. Randles (Cumberland, Cockermouth); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 568

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

MOCK COURTS-MARTIAL IN THE GRENADIER GUARDS.—Questions, Mr. Labouchere (Northampton), Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis), Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.), and Mr. Pirie (Aberdeenshire, N.); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 569

THE FLOGGING OF TWO DRUMMER BOYS.—Questions, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.), and Colonel Nolan (Galway, N.); Answers, Mr. Brodrick ... 572

BOER PRISONERS OF WAR—COLONIAL CONTROL.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, The Postmaster-General, Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.), and Mr. Brodrick 573

SOMALILAND CAMPAIGN.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 575

THE LANCERS—PRIZES FOR LANCE PRACTICE.—Question, Colonel Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 576

LANCE *v.* SWORD—Questions, Colonel Legge and Major Wyndham-Quin (Glamorganshire, S.); Answers, Mr. Brodrick 576

MARINE ENGINEERING COMMITTEE—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 576

LORD GOSCHEN'S COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 577

INCREASE OF THE FLEET—COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) ... 578

CONVEYANCE OF STORES TO SOUTH AFRICA—WAGES OF SAILORS AND FIREMEN.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 579

LABOUR ORDINANCES IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 579

INDIA—WATER STORAGE AND IRRIGATION COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Samuel Smith (Flintshire); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord George Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) 580

Mar. 12.] *Page*

INDIAN CURRENCY.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 581

CONCESSIONS IN EAST AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Malcolm (Suffolk, Stowmarket); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 581

THE PROSECUTION OF MR. WHITAKER WRIGHT.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles, Mr. Norman (Wolverhampton, S.), and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) ... 581

COURT OF SESSION—EDINBURGH.—Question, Mr. Ure (Linlithgowshire); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) ... 583

DEATH CERTIFICATES IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 583

HIGH PAVEMENT SCHOOL—NOTTINGHAM.—Questions, Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.); Answers, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 584

CHARLEVILLE LICENSING CASE.—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 585

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS—GRADE REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 586

IRISH TEACHERS' INCREMENTS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 586

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION AT MONIVEA, COUNTY GALWAY.—Question, Mr. Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 587

FISHING SEASON IN COUNTY DOWN.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 587

CASTLETOWN POSTMISTRESS.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 588

THE EX-BANBRIDGE POSTMASTER.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 589

THE IRISH LAND BILL.—Question, Mr. Malcolm; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 589

NEW BILLS.

Grocers' Licences (Scotland) Bill.—"To abolish Dealers' or Grocers' Licences in Scotland," presented by Sir John Leng; supported by Mr. Crombie, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Pirie, and Mr. Hunter Graig; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 5th May, and to be printed. [Bill 95.] 589

County Courts Bill.—"To extend the jurisdiction of the County Courts, and to amend the Acts relating or giving jurisdiction thereto," presented by Sir William Holland; supported by Mr. Crombie, Sir Alfred Hickman, Mr. McKenna, Mr. Parkes, and Mr. Schwann; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 96.] 589

Licensing Acts Consolidation (Scotland) Bill.—"To consolidate the Laws relating to Licensing in Scotland," presented by the Lord Advocate; supported by Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland and Mr. Anstruther; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 97.] ... 590

Page

Berwickshire County Town Bill.—"To constitute the Town of Duns to be the Head Burgh or County Town of Berwickshire," presented by the Lord Advocate; supported by the Solicitor-General for Scotland; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed [Bill 98.] … … 590

Local Government (Scotland) Bill.—"To make further provision for Local Government in counties of Scotland; and for other purposes," presented by Mr. Maxwell; supported by Mr. Nicol, Mr. Eugene Wason, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Hozier, and Sir Charles Renshaw; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 25th March, and to be printed. [Bill 99.] … 590

Poor Law Officers' Superannuation (Scotland) Bill.—"To provide for Superannuation Allowances to Poor Law Officers and Servants in Scotland; and for contributions towards such allowances by such officers and servants, and to make other relative provisions," presented by Mr. Maxwell; supported by Sir William Arrol, Mr. Nicol, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Cross, Colonel Denny, Mr. Ure, and Sir Charles Renshaw; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 25th March, and to be printed. [Bill 100.] … 590

Registration of Firms Bill.—"For the Registration of Firms and Persons carrying on Business under Trade Names," presented by Mr. Emmott; supported by Mr. James Heath, Sir Alfred Hickman, Sir William Holland, and Mr. Walter Palmer; to be read a second time upon Friday, 8th May, and to be printed. [Bill 101.] … … … … … … 591

SUPPLY [1ST ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £9,647,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the charge for the pay, allowances and other charges of His Majesty's Army at home and abroad (exclusive of India) (General Staff, Regiments, Reserve, and Departments), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

Mr. Winston Churchill (Oldham) … … … … … … 591
Col. Welby (Taunton) … … … … … … … 606
Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) … … … 610

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A, Pay, etc., of General Staff, be reduced by £60,000."—(*Mr. Courtenay Warner.*)

Col. Blundell (Lancashire, Ince) … … … … … … 612
Sir A. Hayter (Walsall) … … … … … … … 613
Mr. Galloway (Manchester, S.W.) … … … … … … 614
Mr. Brynmor Jones (Swansea District) … … … … … 615
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) … … … … … … 616
The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) … … … … … … … 616
The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) … 617
Lieut.-Col. George Kemp (Lancashire, Heywood) … … … … 622

Mar. 12.] Page

Major Jameson (Clare, W.) 626
Major Seely (Isle of Wight) 627
Mr. Winston Churchill 630
Mr. Gibson Bowles 631

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 94; Noes, 226. (Division List No. 24.)

Mr. Labouchere (Northampton) 635

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £8,937,000 be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

Mr. Galloway (Manchester, S W.)... 640
Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.) 641
Lord Stanley 642
Lieut.-Col. George Kemp 645
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 647
Mr. Bryn Roberts (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) 648
Mr. Courtenay Warner 649

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 80; Noes, 223. (Division List No. 25.)

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Whereupon Mr. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 208; Noes 61. (Division List No. 26.)

Original Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 202; Noes, 53. (Division List No. 27.)

Resolution to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Bristol, London, and Southern Counties Railway Bill (BY ORDER).—Read a second time and committed.

City and North East Suburban Electric Railway Bill (BY ORDER).—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. D. J. Morgan (Essex, Walthamstow) 657

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Vicary Gibbs (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) 663

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Vicary Gibbs.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Sir Frederick Banbury (*Camberwell, Peckham*) 664
Mr. John Burns (*Battersea*) 665
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (*Mr. Bonar Law, Glasgow, Blackfriars*) 671
Mr. Courtenay Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) 674
Mr. Forde Ridley (*Bethnal Green, S.W.*) 674

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 162 ; Noes, 60. (Division List No. 28.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway Bill.

Mr. Griffith Boscawen (*Kent, Tunbridge*) 677

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee to omit, in Clause 8, page 7, all the words before the words 'the Company,' in line 32, and all the words after the word respectively,' in line 36."—(*Mr. Griffith Boscawen.*)

Mr. Skewes-Cox (*Surrey, Kingston*) 679
Mr. Vicary Gibbs (*Hertfordshire, St. Albans*) 679

Question put and agreed to.

The City and South London Railway Bill.

Mr. Griffith Boscawen 680

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee to omit, in Clause 4, the words 'without being required to purchase the same or any easement therein or thereunder.'"—(*Mr. Griffith Boscawen.*)

Mr. Cohen (*Islington, E.*) 680
Mr. Griffith Boscawen 681
Mr. John Burns 681

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes ; 57 ; Noes, 162. (Division List No. 29.)

SUPPLY [FIRST ALLOTTED DAY.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Mar. 12.] Page

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,638,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Retired Pay, Half-pay, and other Non-Effective Charges for Officers, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 684
Mr. Courtenay Warner 686
Mr. Pirie 686
Mr. Brodrick 686
Sir Walter Foster (*Derbyshire, Ilkeston*) 687
Mr. Brodrick 688
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 689
Mr. Broadhurst (*Leicester*) 690

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Broadhurst.*)

Mr. Brodrick 690
Mr. Lough 691
Mr. Whitley 692
Lord Hugh Cecil (*Greenwich*) 693

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 64; Noes, 154. (Division List No. 30.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Courtenay Warner 695
Mr. Alfred Hutton (*Yorkshire, W.R., Morley*) 695

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Rewards to Officers for Distinguished Services) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Alfred Hutton*).

Mr. Brodrick 696

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Pirie 697

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item C (Half-Pay of Regimental and Departmental Officers eligible for Employment) be reduced by £7,680."—(*Mr. Pirie.*)

Mr. Brodrick 698
Mr. Lough 698

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 64; Noes, 153. (Division List No. 31.)

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Whereupon Mr. SECRETARY BRODRICK rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 155; Noes, 64. (Division List No. 32.)

Original Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

NEW BILLS.

POOR PRISONERS' DEFENCE.—Bill to make provision for the Defence of Poor Prisoners, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bousfield, Mr. Cripps, Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. Perks, Mr. Kimber, Mr. Butcher, Mr. Atherley-Jones, Mr. Marshall Hall, and Mr. Duke.

Poor Prisoners' Defence Bill.—"To make provision for the Defence of Poor Prisoners," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 102.] 703

FALSE CHARACTERS.—Bill for the prevention of giving False Characters to servants, and of offences connected therewith, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bousfield and Mr. Herbert Robertson.

False Characters Bill.—"For the better prevention of giving False Characters to servants and of offences connected therewith," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 26th March, and to be printed. [Bill 103.] 704

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—

Electric Lighting (London) [H.L.]; the same was ordered to lie on the Table.

North-Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill [H.L.]; a petition of Messrs. Baker, Lees, and Company, of 54, Parliament Street, Westminster, parliamentary agents, praying for leave to present a petition of the Promoters of the Shropshire and Worcestershire and East Denbighshire Electric Power Bill, praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill, although the time limited by Standing Order No. 92, for presenting such petition, has expired; read, and ordered to lie on the Table; and Standing Order No. 92 to be considered on Monday next, in order to its being dispensed with in respect of the same petition.

Maryport Harbour Bill [H.L.]; read 2^a (according to order).

Life Association of Scotland Bill [H.L.]; Milford Docks Bill [H.L.]; India-rubber, Guttapercha, and Telegraph Works Company Bill [H.L.]; Lima Railways Bill [H.L.]; committed.

Sheffield and South Yorkshire Navigation Bill [H.L.]; committed: the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 705

Mar. 13.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY.—Evidence of Lieutenant-Colonel D. A. Kinloch, C.B., M.V.O., before the Court of Inquiry held by the order of the General Officer Commanding the Home District, on 14th December, 1902... 705

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Code of Regulations for Day Schools, 1903 ... 706

MINES AND QUARRIES (GENERAL REPORT AND STATISTICS FOR 1901. PART IV. COLONIAL AND FOREIGN STATISTICS).—Statistics relating to persons employed, out-put, and accidents at mines and quarries in the British Colonies and in foreign countries.

Presented [by Command] and ordered to lie on the Table 706

AFFAIRS IN MACEDONIA.

Lord Newton 706
The Lord Bishop of Hereford 713
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 718
Earl Spencer 722

The Militia Ballot Bill [H.L.].

The Earl of Wemyss 723
The Under-Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Hardwicke*) 724
The Earl of Wemyss 726

Moved, "That this Bill be now read 1ª."—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

On Question, Bill read 1ª, and to be printed. (No. 14.)

Marine Insurance Bill [H.L.]—[SECOND READING.]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 727
Earl Russell 727
The Earl of Halsbury 728

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

House adjourned at five minutes past Six o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1903.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz.—

Lancashire and Yorkshire and London and North Western Railways (Steam Vessels) Bill.

North Eastern Railway Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 728

Mar. 13.] *Page*

WIGAN CORPORATION TRAMWAYS.—Petition for additional provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 728

PETITIONS.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE BILL.—Petition from London, against; to lie upon the Table 729

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.—Petition from Walsall, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 729

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.—Petition from Bristol, in favour; to lie upon the Table 729

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour; from Dreghorn; Auchindoir; and Tarbolton; to lie upon the Table 729

FRANCHISE AND REMOVAL OF WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL.—Petition from Leamington, in favour; to lie upon the Table 729

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.—Petitions against: from South Stoneham; Northampton; Mountain Ash; Pontardawe; Battersea; Swindon; Barrow-in-Furness; Cerne; Lewisham; Willington Quay; Guisborough; West Ham; and Sunderland; to lie upon the Table 729

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.—Petition from Thornhill, in favour; to lie upon the Table 729

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.—Petition from Radcliffe, in favour; to lie upon the Table 729

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

RAILWAY, ETC., BILLS.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 12th March; *Mr. Gerald Balfour*]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 73.] 729

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) (CODE 1903).—Copy presented, of Code of Regulations for Day Schools, 1903, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 729

MINES AND QUARRIES.—Copy presented, of General Report and Statistics for the year 1901, Part IV., Colonial and Foreign Statistics; Statistics relating to Persons employed, Output, and Accidents at Mines and Quarries in the British Colonies and Foreign Countries [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 729

ARMY.—Copy presented, of Evidence of Lieutenant-Colonel D. A. Kinloch, C.B., M.V.O., before the Court of Inquiry held by the Order of the General Officer Commanding the Home District on 14th December, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 730

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—Charles Ramsay Devlin, esquire, for the Borough of Galway 730

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of Surrey (North Western or Chertsey Division), in the room of Henry Currie Leigh-Bennett, esquire, deceased.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*) 730

Mar. 13.] Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

ARMY ESTIMATES—INCREASED PAY.—Question, Sir Edgar Vincent (Exeter); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 730

CUNARD AGREEMENT.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 730

PRIVATE BILL PROCEDURE.—Question, Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 731

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—SEA TRANSPORT MEDAL.—Question, Capt. Jessel (St. Pancras, S.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 731

NAVY—PROMOTION OF WARRANT OFFICERS TO LIEUTENANTS.—Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 732

ROYAL MARINES.—Question, Mr. Lockie (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 732

POLICE AND SANITARY REGULATION COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 732

EDUCATION ACT—PAYMENT OF GRANTS—BELTON CHARITY.—Question, Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire); Answer, Sir William Anson ... 733

Church Discipline Bill—[SECOND READING.]—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth) 733

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Cripps (Lancashire, Stretford) 746
Mr. Lawson Walton (Leeds, S.) 756
Mr. Vicary Gibbs (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) 763
Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) 772
Sir William Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.) 776
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 786

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put," but Mr. SPEAKER withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.

Debate resumed.

Mr. Stock (Liverpool, Walton) 798
Mr. White Ridley (Stalybridge) 799
Sir Samuel Hoare (Norwich) 799
Colonel Sandys (Lancashire, Bootle) 801
Sir John Kennaway (Devonshire, Honiton) 802
Mr. Seely (Lincoln) 803
Sir John Dorington (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) 804

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 190; Noes, 139. (Division List No. 33.)

Bill accordingly read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.—First Report brought up, and read; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 74.] 807

CIVIL SERVICE (EXCESS), 1901–2.—Copy presented, of Statement of the Sum required to be voted in order to make good an Excess on the Grant for National Gallery of Ireland for the year ended 31st March, 1902 [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 75.] 808

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—

Birmingham District Tramways [H.L.].
Hove, Worthing, and District Tramways [H.L.].
South Staffordshire Tramways [H.L.].
North Cheshire Tramways [H.L.].
Dewsbury, Batley, and Birstal Tramways [H.L.].

And also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with:—

Jewish Colonisation Association—(Petition for Bill).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 809

South Staffordshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Hove, Worthing, and District Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Chatham and District Light Railway Bill [H.L.]; Mid Yorkshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Shepshed Urban District Gas Bill [H.L.]; South Lancashire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Preston and Horwich Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Southern Tramways (Lancashire) Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Southern Tramways (Cheshire) Bill [H.L.]; Derby Gas Bill [H.L.]; read 2ª.

Manchester Corporation Bill [H.L.]; North Cheshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; read 2ª (according to order).

North-Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill [H.L.]; Standing Order No. 92, considered (according to order), and dispensed with, with respect to a Petition of the Promoters of the Shropshire, Worcestershire, and East Denbighshire Electric Power Bill. Leave given to present the said Petition.

Macclesfield and District Electric Tramways Bill [H.L.]; to be read 2ª on Monday next.

Didcot, Newbury, and Southampton Railway Bill [H.L.]; North Navigation Collieries Bill [H.L.]; King's College, London, Bill [H.L.]; committed.

Harrow and Stanmore Gas Bill [H.L.]; Taff Vale Railway Bill [H.L.]; London and North-Western Railway Bill [H.L.]; Birmingham Corporation Bill [H.L]; Brighton Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Exeter Corporation Bill [H.L.]; committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 809

Mar. 16.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS.—Annual Series, No. 2943, Russia (Odessa) (supplementary) 810

PHYSICAL TRAINING (SCOTLAND).—Report of the Royal Commission on Physical Training (Scotland).

Vol. I. Report and appendix.
Vol. II. Minutes of evidence and index.
Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table 810

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS, 1853 TO 1891 (CONDITIONAL LICENCES).—Licence to be at large, granted by His Majesty to Rolla Richards, to which was annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule A of Penal Servitude Act, 1864 810

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 AND 1896.—Three Orders, numbered 6,620, 6,621, and 6,633 respectively, relating to the landing of foreign animals in Great Britain 810

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

(1.) Special Exceptions (Meal Hours in Electrical Stations). Order, dated 11th March, 1903, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in Pursuance of Section 40 (4) of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, extending (subject to certain conditions) the special exceptions as to meal hours to young persons above the age of sixteen years employed at electrical stations.

(2.) Special Exception (Night Work at Electrical Stations). Order, dated 11th March, 1903, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 54 (4) of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, extending the special exception under that section (subject to certain conditions) to the employment at night in electrical stations of male young persons of the age of sixteen and upwards.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table... 810

PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILLS.—Ordered,—

That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Thursday, the 18th day of June next.

That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill originating in this House shall be read a first time after Tuesday, the 5th day of May next.

That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Thursday, the 18th day of June next.

That when a Bill shall have passed this House with Amendments, these orders shall not apply to any new Bill sent up from the House of Commons which the Chairman of Committees shall report to the House is substantially the same as the Bill so amended.

That this House will not receive any petition for a Private Bill later than Tuesday, the 5th day of May next, unless such Private Bill shall have been approved by the High Court of Justice; nor any Petition for a Private Bill approved by the High Court of Justice after Friday, the 8th day of May next.

That this House will not receive any report from the Judges upon petitions presented to this House for Private Bills after Friday, the 8th day of May next.

Ordered, That the said orders be printed and published, and affixed on the doors of this House and Westminster Hall. [No. 15.] 811

ARMY (VOLUNTEER RIFLE RANGES).

The Earl of Dartmouth 811

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for Papers giving the details of the manner in which the £170,000 allocated for Volunteer ranges in the years 1900–1901 has been distributed."—(*The Earl of Dartmouth.*)

The Marquess of Huntley 813
The Under-Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Hardwicke*)... ... 814
Earl Spencer 816
The Earl of Dartmouth 816
The Earl of Hardwicke 817

Light Locomotives (Ireland) Bill—[SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The President of the Board of Education (*The Marquess of Londonderry*) 819

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Marquess of Londonderry.*)

Earl Spencer 820
The Marquess of Granby 820
The Marquess of Londonderry 820

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

THE LICENSING QUESTION.

Lord Burton 821
The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 823

House adjourned at Twenty minutes past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means ... 828

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions of Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz. :—

Great Central Railway Bill.
Great Western Railway Bill.
Lanarkshire and Dunbartonshire Railway Bill.
Metropolitan District Railway (Various Powers) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 828

Mar. 16.] *Page*

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 63 has been complied with, viz. :—

Croydon and District Electric Tramways Bill.

South Shields, Sunderland and District Tramways Bill.

Wellingborough and District Tramroads Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 828

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for the following Bill, originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz. :—

Jewish Colonisation Association Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 829

PRIVATE BILLS (PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISION) (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for additional Provision in the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz. :—

Beckenham Urban District Council Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

Great Eastern Railway (No. 1) Bill ; Great Eastern Railway (No. 2) Bill ; Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill ; Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway (Various Powers) Bill [by Order]. Read a second time, and committed 829

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (NO. 1).—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Urban Districts of Bray and Dungarvan, and the counties of Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford, ordered to be brought in Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland and Mr. Wyndham 829

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 2).—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the county of Waterford, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland and Mr. Wyndham 830

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Urban Districts of Bray and Dungarvan, and the counties of Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford," presented, and read the first time ; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 104.] 830

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the county of Waterford," presented, and read the first time ; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 105.] 830

Mar. 16.] Page

PETITIONS.

County Courts Jurisdiction Extension Bill.—Petitions in favour: from Gloucestershire; Sussex; Leicestershire; and Exeter; to lie upon the Table 830

Detention of Poor Persons (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions in favour: from Aberlemno; West Linton; Peebles; Kilninian; and Kilmartin; to lie upon the Table 830

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petition of the Scottish School Attendance Officers' Association, in favour; to lie upon the Table 830

Rating of Machinery Bill.—Petitions against: from Felling; Chester-le-Street; Wigan; Chichester; Edmonton; South Shields (two); Jarrow; and North of England United Coal Trade Association; to lie upon the Table 831

Rating of Machinery Bill.—Petition from Jarrow, in favour; to lie upon the Table 831

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Post Office Savings Banks Funds.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 9th March; *Mr. Channing*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 76.] 831

Physical Training (Scotland) (Royal Commission).—Copy presented, of Report of the Royal Commission on Physical Training in Scotland. Vol. I., Report and Appendix, and Vol. II., Minutes of Evidence and Index [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 831

Factory and Workshop Acts (Special Exceptions—Meal Hours in Electrical Stations).—Copy presented, of Order, dated 11th March, 1903, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 40 (4) of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, extending (subject to certain conditions) the special exceptions as to meal hours to young persons above the age of sixteen years employed in Electrical Stations [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 831

Factory and Workshop Acts (Special Exception—Night Work at Electrical Stations).—Copy presented, of Order, dated 11th March, 1903, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 54 (4) of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, extending the special exception under that section (subject to certain conditions) to the employment at night in electrical stations of male young persons of the age of sixteen years and upwards [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 831

Penal Servitude Acts (Conditional Licence).—Copy presented, of licence granted to Rolla Richards, a convict, permitting him to be at large, to which are annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule A of The Penal Servitude Act, 1864 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 832

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 and 1896.—Copies presented, of Three Orders, numbered 6620, 6621, and 6633, respectively, relating to the landing of foreign animals in Great Britain [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 832

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.

Mar. 16.] *Page*

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES, WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION SCHEMES, INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES, AND TRADE UNIONS.—Reports of the Chief Registrar for the year ending 31st December, 1902 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 77.] 832

AMERICAN MAIL SERVICE.—Return ordered, "showing the number of days, hours, and minutes occupied in the transit of the Royal Mails, both outward and inward carried during the year 1902 by steamships between Queenstown and New York, between Southampton and New York, and also between New York and Plymouth; the Return to specify the names of steamers, and to indicate, by asterisk or otherwise, those not carrying mails under contract."—(*Sir John Leng.*) 832

LABOURERS' COTTAGES (IRELAND).—Return ordered, "in respect of Labourers' Cottages in Ireland, showing, (1) county; (2) rural district; (3) valuation of rural district; (4) number of Labourers' Cottages (a) built, (b) in course of construction; (5) amount of loans (a) sanctioned, (b) received; (6) amount required to be raised annually in repayment of loans sanctioned; (7) amount which would be raised by the maximum rate of one shilling in the pound allowed for purposes of Acts; (8) rate per pound required to raise amount specified in Column 6; (9) present poundage rate levied on rural district for Labourers Acts' purposes; (10) amount of Exchequer Contribution for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1903; (11) amount of rent received from tenants of cottages and plots during year; (12) unissued balance, if any, of county's share of Exchequer Contribution; (13) totals per county, and province, and for all Ireland; (14) the return to be made up to the 31st day of March, 1903."—(*Mr. Thomas O'Donnell.*) ... 832

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

DELHI DURBAR.—Question, Mr. Caine (Cornwall, Camborne); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour ... ... — 833

SWINE FEVER—POLICE PROSECUTIONS.—Question, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 833

NAVY—SERVICE ON ROYAL YACHT—PROMOTIONS.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 834

NAVAL CADETS.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 834

EVACUATION OF SHANGHAI.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Lord Cranborne 835

ATROCITIES IN THE CONGO.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, Lord Cranborne 836

ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION—IRISH INDUSTRIES.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Lord Cranborne 836

LOCAL COUNCILS—PAYMENT OF GOVERNMENT GRANTS.—Question, Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 836

IMPORTED MILK—PRESERVATIVES.—Question, Sir Edward Strachey; Answer, Mr. Ritchie 837

SCOTLAND—TREATMENT OF CONSUMPTION AS AN INFECTIOUS DISEASE.—Question, Mr. Corbett (Glasgow, Tradeston); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 837

Mar. 16.] *Page*

CIVIL SERVICE—CLERKS AT MAXIMUM SALARY.—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 838

NEW POST OFFICE AT LURGAN.—Question, Col. Saunderson (Armagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 838

EXTRA POLICE AT BALLYLANEEN.—Question, Mr. Power (Waterford, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 838

IRELAND—ESTATES FOR SALE IN THE LAND JUDGES COURT.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 839

BANDOLIERS FOR ARMY AND VOLUNTEERS.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 839

CAVALRY—REASONS FOR ABOLITION OF LANCE.—Question, Major Wyndham-Quin (Glamorganshire, S.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 840

OFFICERS ON HALF-PAY.—Question, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick... 840

WEST YORKSHIRE (VOLUNTEER) ARTILLERY.—Question, Mr. Samuel Roberts (Sheffield, Ecclesall); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 840

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

MILITARY WORKS BILL.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) ... 841

FLOGGING OF DRUMMER BOYS.—Question, Mr. O'Mara (Kilkenny, S.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 841

CAVALRY ARMS.—Questions, Col. Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square), and Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 842

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR MEDALS.—Questions, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend), and Sir George Bartley (Islington, N.); Answers, Mr. Brodrick 842

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S MISSION.—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 843

BOER PRISONERS OF WAR.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answers, Mr. Brodrick and Mr. J. Chamberlain 844

BOER PRISONERS AT BERMUDA.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 846

AMNESTY OF CAPE REBELS.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 846

SOUTH AFRICA—VRYHEID.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 846

NAVAL WORKS BILL.—Question, Mr. Buchanan; Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 874

MEMORANDUM ON NAVAL TRAINING.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster... 847

Mar. 16.] *Page*

NAVY—CHANGES IN KING'S REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 848

OIL FUEL FOR THE NAVY.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 848

INDIAN CAVALRY.—Question, Col. Legge; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord George Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) 849

INDIAN ARMY CHARGES.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 849

PORT OF LONDON BILL.—Question, Sir F. Dixon-Hartland (Middlesex, Uxbridge); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central)... 849

CANADIAN AND AUSTRALIAN EXPORT BOUNTIES.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 850

THE PENRHYN QUARRY DISPUTE.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 850

CLUBS REGISTERED UNDER THE LICENSING ACT.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 851

LICENSING (SCOTLAND) ACTS, AMENDMENT BILL.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 851

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S FIAT.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas; Answer, The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 852

THE WHITAKER WRIGHT CASE—COSTS OF THE PROSECUTION.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 852

IRELAND AND THE ST. LOUIS EXPOSITION.—Questions, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.), and Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover), and the First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 853

ROSCREA LABOURERS' COTTAGE SCHEME. — Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 854

IRISH PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 854

LISMORE WORKHOUSE MASTERSHIP.—Question, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 854

KILLEA DISTURBANCE. — Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien (Tipperary, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 856

CORK ASSIZES.—Question, Captain Donelan (Cork, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 856

PROMOTION IN THE DUBLIN SORTING OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 856

BALLINHASSIG POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Crean (Cork, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 857

Mar. 16.] Page

COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL DEFENCE.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 857

PRIVATE BANKS BALANCE SHEETS.—Question, Sir James Joicey (Durham, Chester-le-Street); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 858

THE CASE OF COLONEL KINLOCH.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Ruling, Mr. Speaker 858

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. John Redmond (Waterford), Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire), and Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 859

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—William Crooks, esquire, for the Borough of Woolwich 860

NEW BILL.

Contracts (India Office) Bill.—"To remove doubts as to the mode of execution of certain contracts entered into on behalf of the Secretary of State for India in Council," presented by Secretary Lord George Hamilton; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 106.] ... 861

SUPPLY (NAVY ESTIMATES).

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

NAVY ESTIMATES.

The Secretary to the Admiralty (*Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.*) ... 861

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 882
Sir John Gorst (*Cambridge University*) 898

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'the new scheme of Naval Training embodied in the Memorandum of the First Lord of the Admiralty, dated 16th December, 1902, is calculated, in its present form, seriously to impair the efficiency of the Navy, and that, before being carried into effect, it should be reconsidered and modified.'"—(*Mr. Gibson Bowles.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Edmund Robertson (*Dundee*) 906
Mr. Haldane (*Haddingtonshire*) 913
Sir Fortescue Flannery (*Yorkshire, Shipley*) 922
Mr. Kearley (*Devonport*) 925
Mr. Arnold-Forster 929
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 937

Question put.

Mar 16.] Page

The House divided:—Ayes, 200; Noes, 57. (Division List No. 34.)

Main Question again proposed.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till this evening,

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY (NAVY ESTIMATES).

Order Read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [16th March], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Main Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 941
Sir William Allan (Gateshead) 948
Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth) 955
Mr. Kearley (Devonport) 963
The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge)... 966
Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid.)... 968
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Brightside) 976
Mr. Harwood (Bolton) 976

Question put, and agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That 127,100 men and boys be employed for the sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904, including 91,806 Royal Marines."

Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) 978

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Buchanan.*)

Mr. Arnold-Forster 979

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

MUNICIPAL TRADING.—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [4th March], "That it is expedient that a Select Committee of this House be appointed to join with a Committee of the Lords to consider and report as to the principles which should govern powers given by Bills and Provisional Orders to Municipal and other local authorities for industrial enterprise within or without the area of their jurisdiction."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

Mr. John Burns (*Battersea*) 979

And, it being Midnight, the Debate stood adjourned.

Church Discipline Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 :—

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next 984

Adjourned at Six minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS : TUESDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1903.

SAT FIRST.—The Lord Lyveden sat first in Parliament after the death of his uncle 985

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Dewsbury, Batley, and Birstal Tramways Bill [H.L.], read 2ª.

Bradford Corporation Bill [H.L.], Committed : The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection... 985

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Orders in Council of 12th March, 1903, entitled—

The Foreign Marriages Order in Council, 1903;
The Somaliland Order in Council, 1903; and
The Wei-hai-Wei Order in Council Amendment Order, 1903 985

ASSIZES ACTS 1876 AND 1877.—Orders in Council of 12th March, 1903, relating to Spring Assizes Counties No. 2 and No. 3 985

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1876, AND YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS ACT, 1901.—Order in Council of 12th March, 1903, applying certain provisions of the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901, to Day Industrial Schools 985

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACT, 1865 AND 1869.—Order in Council of 12th March, 1903, amending the regulations as to Greenwich Hospital pensions and allowances to widows and children of seamen or marines killed on duty or who died from injuries received.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 985

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877.—Statutes made by the Governing Bodies of—

Queen's College, Oxford, on 26th November, 1902, altering Statutes II. and XXIII., and the Statute concerning exhibitions within the College.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford, on 29th November, 1902, amending Clauses 19, 22, and 77 of the College Statutes.

St. John's College, Cambridge, on 28th November, 1902, amending the College Statutes.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. [No. 16.] 985

Mar. 17.] Page

Bank Holidays (Ireland) Bill [SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Dunraven 986

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Dunraven.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

Prevention of Cruelty to Children (Amendment) Bill [H.L.]. A Bill to amend the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act, 1894, and to provide for the punishment of incest, was presented by the Lord Alverstone; read 1ª, and to be printed. [No. 17.] 986

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means ... 986

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISION) (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for additional Provision in the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz:—

Wigan Corporation Tramways Bill.

Ordered, that the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

Sheffield Corporation Bill, Wigan Corporation Tramways Bill, read a second time, and committed 987

Great Western Railway (Pension Fund) Bill.—Reported, with an Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 987

Dublin Improvement (Bull Alley Area) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table... 987

THAMES RIVER STEAMBOAT SERVICE.—Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. John Burns and Mr. Whitmore ... 987

PETITIONS.

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Northampton; Manchester; Monmouthshire; Herefordshire; London; and Halifax; to lie upon the Table 987

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES).—Petition from Wakefield, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 987

LICENSING (SCOTLAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—Petition from Dornoch, against; to lie upon the Table 987

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.—Petition from Scottish Poor Law Medical Officers' Association, in favour; to lie upon the Table 987

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.—Petitions against: From Colchester; Itchen; Medway; Faringdon; Auckland; Wells; Newport; Devonport; Sunderland; Camberwell; Cardiff; Sheffield; Glossop; Bromwich; Poplar; Carlisle; Salford; and Romford; to lie upon the Table 988

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).—Copy presented, of Statutes made by the Governing Body of Queen's College, Oxford, on 26th November, 1902, altering Statutes II. and XXIII. and the Statute concerning Exhibitions within the College [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 78.] 988

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).—Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, on 29th November, 1902, amending Clauses 19, 22, and 77 of the College Statutes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 79.] 988

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (CAMBRIDGE).—Copy presented, of Statutes made by the Governing Body of St. John's College, Cambridge, on 28th November, 1902, amending the College Statutes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 80.]... 988

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACTS, 1865 AND 1869.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 12th March, 1903, amending the Regulations as to Greenwich Hospital Pensions and Allowances to Widows and Children of Seamen or Marines killed on duty or who died from injuries received [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 988

ASSIZE ACTS, 1876 AND 1879.—Copies presented, of Orders in Council of 12th March, 1903, relating to Spring Assize Counties Nos. 2 and 3 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 988

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Copies presented, of Orders in Council of 12th March, 1903, entitled (a) The Foreign Marriage Order in Council, 1903; (b) The Somaliland Order in Council, 1903; (c) The Wei-hai-Wei Order in Council Amendment Order, 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 988

DAY INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 12th March, 1901; applying certain provisions of the Youthful Offenders Act, 1903, to Day Industrial Schools [by Act] to lie upon the Table 989

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2943 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 989

SHANGHAI (CONSULAR JURISDICTION).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 4th March; *Mr. Joseph Walton*] (China, No. 2, 1903); to lie upon the Table 989

WINES IMPORTED.—Return ordered, "showing the quantity of wines, at the various degrees of strength, which were imported into the United Kingdom in 1902 from Spain, Portugal, Maderia, France, Germany, Holland, Italy, Australasia, and other countries (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 134, of Session 1902)."—(*Sir Thomas Dewar.*) ... 989

Mar. 17.] *Page*

Intoxicating Liquors (Licences Refused).—Address for "Return of the number of Victuallers, Beerhouses, and other Licences for the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors, the renewal of which has been refused at the General Annual Licensing Meetings and adjournments thereof held in England and Wales during February and March, 1903, showing in each case the ground of such refusal, especially where such ground was in any instance that the Licence was not required, with the number of cases in which notice of appeal was given, and the result of such appeal, if determined (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 353, of Session 1901)."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Revenue and Expenditure (England, Scotland, and Ireland).—Return ordered, "showing, for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1903, (1) the amount contributed by England, Scotland, and Ireland, respectively, to the Revenue collected by Imperial Officers; (2) the Expenditure on English, Scottish, and Irish Services met out of such Revenue; and (3) the balances of Revenue contributed by England, Scotland, and Ireland, respectively, which are available for Imperial Expenditure (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 256, of Session 1902)."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Casualties to Ships.—Return ordered, "of casualties to ships, in the form set out below, showing the date; name and class of the ship damaged; nature of the accident; the number of persons injured; the number of deaths (if any); the result of any inquiry that may have been held into the circumstances; and time in Dockyard for repairs, during the year ending the 31st day of December, 1902:—

Date.	Name and Class of Ship.	Nature of Accident.	Number of Persons Injured.	Number of Deaths (if any).	Result of Inquiry (if any).	Time in Dockyard for Repairs.

(in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 404, of Session 1902)."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Fraudulent Trustees.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 989

Coastguard Service at Dunnottar.—Question, Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 991

Public House Licences—Transfers.—Question, Mr. Colston (Gloucestershire, Thornbury); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 991

Adulterated Food-Stuff—Case at Norwich.—Question, Mr. Price (Norfolk, E.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 992

Civil Service—Promotion of Senior Assistant Clerks.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 992

Dublin University—Women's Degrees.—Question, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 993

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—PENSIONS AND LODGING ALLOWANCE.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 993

BARRACKS AT BUNCRANA—DELAY IN ERECTION. Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 994

ARMY—RELIEFS FOR INDIA.—Question, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 994

EXPLOSIVES FACTORIES—INCREASED WAGES FOR EMPLOYEES.—Question, Col. Lockwood (Essex, Epping); Answer, Lord Stanley 994

ARMY ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT—TENDERS FOR CONTRACT NO. 2, 1773.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, Lord Stanley 995

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

HALF-PAY OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guilford) 995

ARMY STAFF SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Pirie; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 996

LANCE PRACTICE.—Question, Col. Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 996

CANADIAN NAVAL RESERVE —Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.)

RUSSIA AND PERSIA—TARIFF AGREEMENT.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 997

MACEDONIAN GENDARMERIE. — Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Lord Cranborne 997

ALIENS AND WAGE DISPUTES —WORSHIP STREET POLICE COURT EXPERIENCES.—Question, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N.E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 997

DENABY AND CADEBY COLLIERIES STRIKE.—Question, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 998

CREMATION ACT—DEATH CERTIFICATES.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.)... 999

INTERNATIONAL POSTAGE RATES.—Question, Mr. Toulmin (Lancashire, Bury); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.)... 999

CONSTITUTION OF THE BOARD OF TRADE.—Question, Mr. Louis Sinclair (Essex, Romford); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon)... 1000

STANDING ORDERS.—Resolutions reported from the Committee.

1. "That, in the case of the Watford and Edgware Railway Bill, Petition for dispensing with Standing Order 129 in the case of the Petition of 'Hubert Von Herkomer' against the Bill, the said Standing Order ought to be dispensed with."

2. "That, in the case of the Thames River Steamboat Service, Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with :—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that Clause 27 be struck out of the Bill :—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

3. "That, in the case of the Coventry Electric Tramways Bill, Petition for additional Provision, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with :—That the parties be permitted to introduce the additional Provision if the Committee on the Bill think fit."

4. "That, in the case of the South Staffordshire Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with :—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 1A, and 1B be struck out of the Bill :—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

5. "That, in the case of the Wakefield and District Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with :—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramway No. 1 be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of Ardsley East and West District Council be proved before the Committee on the Bill :—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such order has been complied with."

6. "That, in the case of the Tynemouth and District Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with :—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 1A, 1B, 2, 3, 4, 4A, 5, 5A, 5B, 6 and 7 be struck out of the Bill :—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

7. That in the case of the Shepshed Urban District Gas Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with :—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

8. "That, in the case of the South Lancashire Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with :—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 3 and 4 be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the Atherton Urban District Council be proved before the Committee on the Bill :—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

9. "That in the case of the Macclesfield and District Electric Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with :—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13A, 17 and 17A be struck out of the Bill :—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

10. "That, in the case of the Hove, Worthing, and District Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with :—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, and 18 be struck out of the Bill :—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

11. "That, the case of the Manchester Southern Tramways (Cheshire) Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with :—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the

powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 2, and 3 be struck out of the Bill, unless the necessary consents of the local and road authorities be proved before the Committee on the Bill:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

12. "That, in the case of the Manchester Southern Tramways (Lancashire) Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 7, 8, and 9 be struck out of the Bill, unless the necessary consents of the local and road authorities to the said Tramways be proved before the Committee on the Bill:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

13. "That, in the case of the Gosport, Fareham, and Cosham Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 be struck out of the Bill, unless the necessary consents of the local and road authorities be proved before the Committee on the Bill:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

14. "That, in the case of the Hammersmith, City, and North-East London Railway, Petition for leave to deposit a Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought not to be dispensed with."

First thirteen resolutions agreed to.

Report to lie upon the Table 1000

New Member Sworn.—James Henry Mussen Campbell, esquire, for Dublin University (Trinity College) 1003

NEW BILL.

Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill.—"To amend and enlarge the powers of the Crofters' Holding (Scotland) Act, 1886, and The Congested Districts (Scotland) Act, 1897, and to facilitate the acquirement of land for Crofters' Holdings within Congested Districts in Scotland," presented by Mr. John Dewar; supported by Mr. Thomas Shaw, Mr. Weir, and Mr. Cathcart Wason; to be read a second time upon Friday, 8th May, and to be printed. [Bill 107.] 1003

Supply.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Civil Services (Excess), 1901–2.

1. £77 15s. 5d., National Gallery of Ireland.

Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 1003
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. Hayes Fisher, Fulham*) ... 1005
Sir Arther Hayter (*Walsall*) 1005

Vote agreed to.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £6,312,800, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Wages, etc., to Officers, Seamen and Boys, Coast Guard, and the Royal Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) ... 1007
Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth) ... 1015
Sir Robert Reid (Dumfries Burghs) ... 1018
Sir Fortescue Flannery (Yorkshire, Shipley) ... 1023
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) ... 1029
Mr. Yerburgh (Chester) ... 1034
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) ... 1037
The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold Forster, Belfast, W.) ... 1043
Mr. Kearley (Devonport) ... 1050
Mr. Seely (Lincoln) ... 1053
Mr. Arnold-Forster ... 1056
Mr. Labouchere (Northampton) ... 1060

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £5,939,000, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

Sir William Allan (Gateshead) ... 1061
Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland) ... 1062
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) ... 1063
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) ... 1063
Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) ... 1064
Mr. Kearley (Devonport) ... 1064

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 27; Noes, 252. (Division List No. 35.)

Original Question put, and agreed to.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

Gas Light and Coke Company's Acts Amendment Bill [BY ORDER].

Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) ... 1067
Mr. John Burns (Battersea) ... 1069

The Bill was read a second time, and committed.

Gas Light and Coke Company Bill [By Order]; London County Council (General Powers) Bill [By Order].—Read a second time and committed.

BRITISH AND COLONIAL TRADE.

Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpool, Exchange) ... 1069
Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor) ... 1074

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That recent developments of fiscal and commercial policy in foreign countries, leading to the exclusion of British trade from areas in which it has previously been established, call for the serious consideration of His Majesty's Government, in concert with the Colonial Governments, where necessary, in order to safeguard the trade of the Empire."—(*Mr. Charles McArthur.*)

Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) 1079
Sir Robert Ropner (*Stockton*) 1084

Notice taken that forty Members were not present; House counted, and forty Members not being present:—

The House was adjourned at twenty five minutes before Eleven of the Clock till To-morrow.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 18TH MARCH, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means ... 1085

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Lancashire and Yorkshire and London and North-Western Railways (Steam Vessels) Bill; North-Eastern Railway Bill, read a second time and committed 1085

Seaforth and Sefton Junction Railway Bill (by Order), read a second time, and committed 1085

Thames River Steamboat Service Bill.—"To provide for the acquisition and construction of piers and landing places on the River Thames, in the administrative county of London by the London County Council, and to make provision for a service of vessels for passengers and parcels; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time 1085

West Sussex Water Bill.—Order for Second Reading To-morrow read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1085

Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill.—Copy ordered, "of Report of the Board of Trade on the Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) 1085

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 2.)—Ordered, That Arthur Henry Stokes do attend the Committee on Group 2 of Railway Bills on Tuesday next at half-past Eleven of the Clock 1085

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP B).—Ordered, That Joseph Pike do attend the Committee on Group B of Private Bills on Tuesday next at Twelve of the Clock 1086

PETITIONS.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE BILL.—Petition from Lewes, against; to lie upon the Table 1086

Mar. 18.] *Page*

County Courts Jurisdiction Extension Bill.—Petitions in favour: from London (two); Bury; Leeds; Blackburn; Sheffield; and Cheltenham; to lie upon the Table 1086

Detention of Poor Persons (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions in favour: from Falkirk; Oathlaw; Dornoch; and Alves; to lie upon the Table 1086

Rating of Machinery Bill.—Petitions against: from Brentford; Stoke-upon-Trent; Devonport; Newcastle-upon Tyne; Burton-upon-Trent; Dudley; Little Hulton; Worsborough; Weetslade; and Woking; to lie upon the Table 1086

Rating of Machinery Bill.—Petition from Glossop, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1086

Roman Catholic University in Ireland.—Petition from Coatbridge, against establishment; to lie upon the Table... 1087

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill.—Petitions in favour: from Holloway; and Sheffield; to lie upon the Table 1087

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Shanghai (Consular Jurisdiction).—Return [presented 17th March] to be printed. [No. 81.] 1087

Penal Servitude Acts (Conditional Licence).—Copy presented, of licence granted to James Johnstone, a convict under detention in Wormwood Scrubbs Prison, permitting him to leave the prison on condition of his proceeding to the Middlesex Hospital, there to be examined, and, if necessary, to undergo an operation, and there remaining in the custody of a prison officer, and afterwards returning, when fit to do so, to Wormwood Scrubbs Prison [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1087

Board of Education (Code 1903).—Copy presented, of Provisional Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools and Training Colleges, with Schedules, by the Board of Education [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1087

Board of Education.—Copy presented, of Reports from University Colleges, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House 1087

Public Records (Admiralty).—Copy of Tenth Schedule, containing a list and particulars of classes of documents which have been removed from the office of the Commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and deposited in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein [by Act] 1087

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Damage to Breakwater at Port of Ness, Island of Lewis.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray.., ... 1088

Port Ness Harbour.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1088

Steamer Service between Mallaig and Lochnivar, etc.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1088

Mar. 18.] *Page*

VACCINATION IN SCOTLAND—ANIMAL LYMPH.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1089

CUSTOMS WATCHERS—ANNUAL INCREMENTS.—Question, Capt. Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher... 1089

LIBERATION OF SLAVES IN ZANZIBAR AND PEMBA.—Question, Mr. J. W. Wilson (Worcestershire, N.); Answer, Lord Cranborne 1089

PUBLICANS' LICENCES—APPEALS.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1090

SHIPBUILDING AT DEVONPORT.—Question, Mr. Lockie (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1090

INCOME TAX—SUGGESTED ALTERATION IN DATES OF PAYMENT.—Question, Mr. Lockie; Answer, Mr. Ritchie 1091

IRELAND—ANCIENT MONUMENT AT GREENAN, LONDONDERRY.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1091

IRISH FISHERIES—CLOSE SEASONS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1091

LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Ffrench (Wexford, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1092

LABOURERS ACT IN GALWAY—UNEXPENDED BALANCES.—Question, Mr. Nolan (Galway, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1092

DRILL HALL AT DURHAM.—Question, Mr. Wilson (Durham, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1092

ARMY RECRUITING—REJECTIONS ON ACCOUNT OF BAD TEETH.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1093

BOAT SLIPS ON LOUGH SWILLY.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1093

VOLUNTEERS—RECRUITING STATISTICS.—Question, Major Seely (Isle of Wight); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1094

MEAT CONTRACTS—SUBSTITUTION OF FOREIGN FOR HOME-GROWN MEAT.—Question, Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1094

ARMY OFFICERS COMPULSORILY RETIRED.—Question, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1094

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

COMPULSORILY RETIRED OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1095

OFFICERS OF THE AUXILIARY FORCES.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1095

ARMY HORSES.—Question, Colonel Welby (Taunton); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1096

ARMY RETURNS.—Question, Colonel Welby; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1096

ARMY VETERINARY OFFICERS.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1097

ARMY REMOUNT DEPARTMENT.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1097

NEW NAVAL BASE AT ST. MARGARET'S HOPE.—Question, Mr. Black (Banffshire); Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 1097

ALASKA BOUNDARY TRIBUNAL.—Question, Mr. Rose (Cambridgeshire, Newmarket); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 1098

EDUCATION ORDINANCE AT PRETORIA.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answers, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1098

TAXATION ON SOUTH AFRICAN NATIVES.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland), Mr. Bryn Roberts (Carnarvonshire, Eifion), and Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answers, Mr. J. Chamberlain ... 1099

TRANSVAAL WAR CONTRIBUTION.—Question, Mr. Black (Banffshire); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1100

FREE GRANTS FOR WAR LOSSES.—Question, Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1100

CYPRUS.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain ... 1101

IMMIGRATION OF FOREIGN CRIMINALS.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 1101

BRITISH INDIAN PILGRIMS TO MECCA.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Lord Cranborne 1102

BRITISH CONSULAR OFFICERS IN TURKEY.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Lord Cranborne 1102

REGISTRATION OF MOTOR CARS.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Grant Lawson, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 1102

ALIENS IN BRITISH PRISONS. Questions, Mr. Powell-Williams (Birmingham, S.), and Mr. Claude Hay; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 1103

POSTAL ORDER SYSTEM—PROPOSED EXTENSION TO THE COLONIES.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel; Answer, the Postmaster-General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 1104

AFFORESTRY IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. O'Mara (Kilkenny, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1104

LABOURERS' COTTAGE SCHEME.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1104

IRELAND—PEAT FUEL.—Question, Mr. Sheehan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 1105

Mar. 18.] *Page*

IRISH QUIT RENTS.—Question, Mr. O'Mara; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 1105

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean), Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.), Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis), Mr. Lough (Islington, W.), General Laurie (Pembroke and Haverfordwest), and Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answers, Sir A. Acland-Hood (Somersetshire, Wellington), The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.), Mr. J. Chamberlain, and The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1106

NEW BILLS.

Local Records Bill.—"For the Preservation of Public and Private Local Records," presented by Mr. Bull; supported by Mr. Burns, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Atherley-Jones, and Sir Albert Rollit; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 7th April, and to be printed. [Bill 108.] 1110

Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act (1886) Amendment Bill.—"To amend The Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act, 1886," presented by Mr. Weir; supported by Mr. John Dewar, Mr. Leveson-Gower, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Mr. Bignold, Mr. Harmsworth, and Mr. Caldwell; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 109.] 1110

SUPPLY (17TH MARCH).

Resolutions reported.

CIVIL SERVICES (EXCESS), 1901–2.

"That a sum, not exceeding £77 15s. 5d., be granted to His Majesty, to make good an Excess on the Grant for National Gallery of Ireland for the year ended on the 31st day of March, 1902."

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

"That a sum, not exceeding £6,312,800, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses and Wages, etc., to Officers, Seamen and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st of March, 1904."

Resolutions read a second time.

Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 1110
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hayes Fisher, Fulham) ... 1111
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.)... 1112

First Resolution agreed to.

Consideration of Second Resolution deferred till Monday next.

SUPPLY (NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903–4).

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Mar. 18.] *Page*

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £784,300, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the expense of half-pay, reserved, and retired pay to officers of the Navy and Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

Mr. Lough 1113

Motion put, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 1113
Mr. Edmund Robertson (*Dundee*)... 1114
Mr. Buchanan (*Perthshire, E.*) 1115
Mr. Gibson Bowles... 1115
Mr. Kearley (*Devonport*) 1116
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Ritchie, Croydon*)... 1116
Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 1116

Question put, and negatived.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

2. £350,100, Civil Pensions and Gratuities.

Mr. Kearley 1117
General Laurie (*Pembroke and Haverfordwest*) 1117
Mr. Pretyman (*Suffolk, Woodbridge*) 1119

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

SUPPLY REPORT (11TH MARCH).

Resolution reported.

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

"That a number of Land Forces, not exceeding 235,761, all ranks, be maintained for the service of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland at Home and Abroad, excluding His Majesty's Indian Possessions, during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

Resolution read a second time.

Mr. Vicary Gibbs (*Hertfordshire, St. Albans*) 1120
Mr. Beckett (*Yorkshire, N.R., Whitby*) 1133

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out '235,761,' and insert '232,761.'"—(*Mr. Vicary Gibbs.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Resolution."

Mr. Elliot (Durham) 1138
The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) ... 1143
Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester) 1153
Mr. Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Fareham) 1155
Mr. Bryn Roberts (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) 1156
Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich) 1158
Mr. Tomkinson (Cheshire, Crewe)... 1159
Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.) 1161
Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 1161
Sir John Brunner (Cheshire, Northwich) 1162

Question put.

House Divided :—Ayes, 246 ; Noes, 73. (Division List No. 36.)

Resolution agreed to.

SUPPLY [12TH MARCH, AFTERNOON SITTING] REPORT.

Resolution reported.

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

"That a sum, not exceeding £9,647,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Pay, Allowances, and other charges of His Majesty's Army at Home and Abroad (exclusive of India) (General Staff, Regiments, Reserve, and Departments), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

Captain Norton (Newington, W.) 1165
Mr. Courtenay Warner 1167
Mr. George Whiteley (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey)... 1167
The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1168
Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) 1169
Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple) 1169
Mr. Brodrick 1170

Resolution agreed to.

SUPPLY [12TH MARCH, EVENING SITTING]. REPORT.

Resolution Reported.

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

"That a sum, not exceeding £1,638,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Retired Pay, Half-Pay, and other Non-Effective Charges for Officers, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 1170
Mr. Courtenay Warner 1170
Mr. Brodrick 1171

Resolution agreed to.

Mar. 19.] *Page*

EVENING SITTING.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (WALES AND MONMOUTHSHIRE).

Mr. William Jones (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) 1171
Sir Alfred Thomas (Glamorganshire, E.)... 1174

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is desirable to grant self-government in local affairs to Wales, subject to the supreme authority of the Imperial Parliament."—(*Mr. William Jones.*)

Lt.-Col. Pryce Jones (Montgomery Boroughs) 1176
Mr. Edwards (Radnorshire) 1177
Mr. Duke (Plymouth) 1181
Mr. Eugene Wason (Clackmannan and Kinross)... 1182
General Laurie (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) 1182
Mr. Brynmor Jones (Swansea Districts) 1183
Mr. Stock (Liverpool, Walton) 1186
Mr. Osmond Williams (Merionethshire) 1186
The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 1189
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 1196

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 74; Noes, 164. (Division List No. 37.)

School Board Electorate (Scotland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid)... 1205
Sir Frederick Banbury (Camberwell, Peckham) 1207

And, it being Midnight, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturdays (Ireland) Bill.

Considered in Committee—

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:—

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Tuesday next. 1208

Adjourned at three minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 19TH MARCH, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: Wakefield and District Tramways [H.L.] The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Bill [H.L.] A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee.

St. Philip's Chapel (Regent Street) Bill [H.L.]; West Bromwich Corporation Bill [H.L.]; All Saints, Poplar (Rate Abolition) Bill [H.L.]. Reports from His Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Birmingham District Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Thames River Steamboat Service Bill; Jewish Colonisation Association (Petition for Bill). Examiner's Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Thursday next.

St. Philip's Chapel (Regent Street) Bill [H.L.]; West Bromwich Corporation Bill [H.L.] Read 2ª (according to order).

All Saints, Poplar (Rate Abolition) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2ª (according to order).

Scottish American Mortgage Company, Limited Bill [H.L.], committed.

Hastings Harbour District Railway Bill [H.L.] Committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Barry Railway Bill [H.L.] The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn: The order made on Thursday last discharged, and Bill committed.

Nantwich Gas Bill [H.L.]. The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill: The orders made on Thursday last discharged: Ordered, that the Bill be not further proceeded with.

Chard Corporation Gas and Electricity Bill [H.L.] Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table: The orders made on the 9th of March and Thursday last discharged; and Bill committed.

British Gas Light Company (Norwich) Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committe had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table: The orders made on Thursday last discharged; and Bill committed. 1209

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

House of Lords Manuscripts.—The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Calendar of the Manuscripts of the House of Lords, Volume II. (New Series), in continuation of the volumes issued under the authority of the Historical Manuscripts Commission: The same was ordered to be printed. [No. 18.] 1210

China, No. 2 (1903).—Provisional rules defining the respective jurisdiction of the mixed courts of the International and French Settlements at Shanghai 1210

Board of Education.

1. Reports from University Colleges (1902).
2. Provisional code of regulations for public elementary schools and training colleges; with schedules (1903). Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table 1210

Penal Servitude Acts, 1853-1891 (Conditional Licence).—Licence granted by His Majesty to James Johnstone, a convict under detention in Wormwood Scrubbs Prison, permitting him to leave the prison on condition of his proceeding to the Middlesex Hospital, there to be examined, and, if necessary, to undergo an operation, and there remaining in the custody of a prison officer, and afterwards returning, when fit to do so, to Wormwood Scrubbs Prison 1210

Mar. 19.] *Page*

PUBLIC RECORDS (ADMIRALTY DEPARTMENT).—Tenth Schedule containing a list and particulars of Classes of documents which have been removed from the office of the Commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and deposited in the Public Record Office, but which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein 1211

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES, WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION SCHEMES, INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES, AND TRADE UNIONS.—Reports of the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies, for the year ended 31st December, 1902; laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table ... 1211

Electric Lighting (London) Bill [H.L.]. [SECOND READING]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Wolverton 1211

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*Lord Wolverton.*)

Bill read 2ª (according to order).

INSPECTION OF MOTOR BOILERS.

The Earl of Mayo 1212
Lord Wolverton 1212

DISCHARGE OF SOLDIERS WITHOUT PENSIONS.

Earl of Mayo 1212
The Under-Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Hardwicke*)... ... 1213

Licensing Act Amendment Bill [**H.L.**].

The Earl of Wemyss 1214

Moved, That the Bill be now read 1ª.—(*The Earl of Wemyss*).

On Question, agreed to; Bill read 1ª and to be printed (No. 19).

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, till To-morrow at a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 19TH MARCH, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means ... 1215

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz.:—

Cheshire Lines Committee Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 1215

PETITIONS.

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Herne Bay; Halifax (two); Preston; Nottingham; Wimbledon; Ramsgate; Newcastle-upon-Tyne; and Margate; to lie upon the Table 1215

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Houston; Govan; and Lochwinnoch; to lie upon the Table 1216

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.—Petitions against: from Newhaven; Prescot; Pershore; Kingston-upon-Hull; Sunderland; Wem; Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Eastry; and Woodbridge; to lie upon the Table 1216

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.—Petition from Alloa, against establishment; to lie upon the Table... 1216

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NEATH, PONTARDAWE, AND BRANAMAN RAILWAY BILL.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th March; *Mr. Gerald Balfour*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 82.] 1216

ARMY (CLOTHING FACTORY).—Annual Account presented, of the Royal Army Clothing Factory for the year 1901-1902, with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 83.] 1216

ARMY (ORDNANCE FACTORIES).—Annual Account presented, for the year 1901-1902, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 84.] . . 1216

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (ARMY VOTES.)—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 16th March, 1903, under the Appropriation Act, 1902, authorising the temporary application of surpluses on certain Army Votes for the year 1902-1903, to defray excesses on certain Army Votes for the same year [pursuant to Resolution of the House of 4th March, 1879]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 85.] 1216

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

NEW GERMAN TARIFF—COUNTERVAILING DUTIES.—Question, Col. Sadler (Middlesborough); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1217

WALTHAM ABBEY SANITARY INSPECTOR—VISITS TO GOVERNMENT PROPERTY.—Question, Col. Lockwood (Essex, Epping); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher ... 1217

OPEN SPACE IN PALACE GARDENS.—Question, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 1218

EDUCATION SCHEMES RETURNED FOR ALTERATION—CASE OF LOUGHBOROUGH TOWN COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Levy (Leicestershire, Loughborough); Answer, Sir William Anson 1218

POSTAL FACILITIES ON THE CONTINENT.—Question, Mr. Toulmin (Lancashire, Bury); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1219

POSTAL OFFICIALS AS CANDIDATES FOR PARLIAMENT.—Question, Mr. Thomas Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain ... 1219

NOMINATIONS FOR THE NAVY—NUMBER OF VACANCIES.—Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1220

Mar. 19.] *Page*

VACCINATION—COSTS OF EXECUTING DISTRESS WARRANTS.—Question, Mr. Levy; Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1220

INCREASE OF PAY TO BRITISH TROOPS IN INDIA—INCREASE IN INDIAN BUDGET.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 1221

GUARD ROOMS—IMPROVED ACCOMMODATION.—Question, Mr. Colston (Gloucestershire, Thornbury); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1221

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR MEDALS FOR AMERICAN NURSES ON HOSPITAL SHIP "MAINE."—Question, Mr. Tennant (Berwickshire); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1221

IRELAND—BURTONPORT EXTENSION RAILWAY CHARGES.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1222

COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS NOW SITTING.—Question, Mr. Norman (Wolverhampton, S.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1222

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

ARMY COMMISSIONS.—Question, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1223

TRAINING SHIPS ON THE EAST COAST.—Question, Mr. Frederick Wilson Norfolk, Mid); Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge)... 1223

SOUTH AFRICA—NATIVE LABOUR QUESTION.—Questions, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean), and Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 1223

SOUTH AFRICAN SHIPPING RING.—Questions, Mr. Peel (Manchester, S.) and Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Burghs); Answers, Mr. J. Chamberlain ... 1224

DISTRIBUTION OF THE WEST INDIAN RELIEF FUND.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1225

PRIVATE BILL COMMITTEES.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Halsey (Hertfordshire, Watford) 1225

DEATH DUTIES ON LICENSED PROPERTY.—Question, Sir W. Hart Dyke (Kent, Dartford); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 1226

SUGAR AND CORN TAXES.—Questions, Mr. Lough and Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answers, Mr. Ritchie 1227

KING'S SCHOLARSHIPS.—Question, Mr. Helme (Lancashire, Lancaster); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 1228

SHEEP WORRYING IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Black (Banffshire); Answer, The President of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) ... 1228

PARCELS POST RATES.—Questions, Mr. Stuart Samuel (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel) and Mr. Alfred Davies; Answers, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 1229

Mar. 19.] Page

WAGES IN THE POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1229

POST OFFICES ON LICENSED PREMISES.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1230

ABERDEEN NEW POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Pirie; Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey)... 1230

IRISH TRAINING COLLEGES.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1231

WHITE ESTATE, NEAR BANTRY.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly (Cork Co., W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1231

PRIMARY EDUCATION IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1231

IRISH TEACHERS' CAPITATION GRANT.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1231

EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN BILL.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1232

THE BUDGET.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1232

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.), Mr. John Redmond (Waterford), Mr. Whitley (Halifax), Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1232

STANDING COMMITTEES.—Ordered, that all Standing Committees have leave to print and circulate with the Votes the Minutes of their Proceedings and any Amended Clauses of Bills committed to them.—(*Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice.*) 1234

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—Charles Frederick Hutchinson, esquire, M.D., for the County of Sussex (Eastern or Rye Division) 1234

Addenbrooke's Hospital Bill.—"To confirm a scheme of the Charity Commissioners for the management of the Charity called Addenbrooke's Hospital, in the town of Cambridge, in the county of Cambridge, regulated by the Act of the seventh year of George the Third, chapter ninety-nine," presented by Sir Richard Jebb; supported by Mr. Brand, Sir Robert Penrose-Fitzgerald, Sir John Gorst, Mr. Raymond Greene, Mr. Griffith-Boscawen, and Mr. Rose; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 22nd April, and to be printed. [Bill 110.] 1234

Street Traffic Regulation Bill.—"To provide for the Regulation of Traffic in Streets," presented by Mr. Shackleton; supported by Mr. Crooks; to be read a second time upon Friday, 8th May, and to be printed. [Bill 111.] 1234

Petroleum Bill.—"To amend the Petroleum Act, 1879," presented by Mr. Ure; supported by Colonel Denny, Mr. John Burns, and Mr. Trevelyan; to be read a second time upon Thursday, next and to be printed. [Bill 112.] 1234

Mar. 19.] *Page*

Solicitors (Scotland) Bill.—"To amend the law relating to Solicitors in Scotland," presented by Mr. Ure; supported by Mr. Renshaw and Mr. Crombie; to be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 113.] 1235

WAYS AND MEANS.

Moved, "That the Committee of Ways and Means be not interrupted this evening under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House), and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 1235
Mr. John Ellis (*Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe*) 1235
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1236

Ordered, That the Committee of Ways and Means be not interrupted this evening under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House), and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed.—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

SUPPLY [2ND ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Civil Services and Revenue Departments Estimates, 1903–4 (Vote on Account).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £20,265,000, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for or towards defraying the Charges for the following Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904, viz.—

Civil Services.

	£
CLASS II.	
Colonial Office	25,000
CLASS IV.	
Board of Education	6,000,000
CLASS II.	
Board of Agriculture	65,000
CLASS III.	
Crofters Commission, Scotland	2,000
CLASS I.	
Royal Palaces and Marlborough House	40,000
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens	50,000
Houses of Parliament Buildings	16,000
Miscellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain	30,000
Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain	20,000
Diplomatic and Consular Buildings	18,000
Revenue Buildings	225,000
Public Buildings, Great Britain	225,000

	£.
Surveys of the United Kingdom	90,000
Harbours under the Board of Trade	7,000
Peterhead Harbour	6,000
Rates on Government Property	250,000
Public Works and Buildings, Ireland	110,000
Railways, Ireland	80,000

CLASS II.

United Kingdom and England :—

House of Lords Offices	2,000
House of Commons Offices	12,000
Treasury and Subordinate Departments	40,000
Home Office	60,000
Foreign Office	30,000
Privy Council Office, etc.	5,000
Board of Trade	75,000
Mercantile Marine Services	30,000
Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade	3
Charity Commission	15,000
Civil Service Commission	18,000
Exchequer and Audit Department	25,000
Friendly Societies Registry	3,000
Local Government Board	85,000
Lunacy Commission	5,000
Mint (including Coinage)	5
National Debt Office	6,000
Public Record Office	10,000
Public Works Loan Commission	5
Registrar General's Office	19,000
Stationery and Printing	320,000
Woods, Forests, etc., Office of	8,000
Works and Public Buildings, Office of	30,000
Secret Service	40,000

Scotland :—

Secretary for Scotland	25,000
Fishery Board	8,000
Lunacy Commission	3,000
Registrar General's Office	5,000
Local Government Board	6,000

Ireland :—

Lord Lieutenant's Household	2,000
Chief Secretary for Ireland	16,000
Department of Agriculture	75,000
Charitable Donations and Bequests Office	1,000
Local Government Board	25,000
Public Record Office	2,000
Public Works Office	18,000
Registrar General's Office	6,000
Valuation and Boundary Survey	7,000

CLASS III.

United Kingdom and England :—

Law Charges	35,000
Miscellaneous Legal Expenses	27,000
Supreme Court of Judicature	140,000
Land Registry	20,000

Mar. 19.]

	£	*Page*
County Courts	8,000	
Police, England and Wales	18,000	
Prisons, England and the Colonies	340,000	
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain...	140,000	
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum	140,000	
Scotland :—		
Law Charges and Courts of Law	30,000	
Register House, Edinburgh	15,000	
Prisons, Scotland	40,000	
Ireland :—		
Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions	35,000	
Supreme Court of Judicature, and other Legal Departments...	45,000	
Land Commission	55,000	
County Court Officers, etc.	46,000	
Dublin Metropolitan Police	45,000	
Royal Irish Constabulary	600,000	
Prisons, Ireland	50,000	
Reformatory and Industrial Schools	55,000	
Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum	3,000	
Class IV.		
United Kingdom and England :—		
British Museum	80,000	
National Gallery	10,000	
National Portrait Gallery	3,000	
Wallace Collection	4,000	
Scientific Investigation, etc., United Kingdom ...	22,000	
Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales	42,000	
Scotland :—		
Public Education	750,000	
National Gallery	3,000	
Ireland :—		
Public Education	730,000	
Endowed School Commissioners	400	
National Gallery	3,000	
Queen's Colleges	2,500	
Class V.		
Diplomatic and Consular Services	250,000	
Uganda, Central and East Africa Protectorates, and Uganda Railway	320,000	
Colonial Services	300,000	
Cyprus, Grant-in-Aid	85,000	
Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable	32,000	
Class VI.		
Superannuation and Retired Allowances	280,000	
Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, etc.	2,000	
Miscellaneous, Charitable and other Allowances ...	1,000	
Hospitals and Charities, Ireland	17,000	

Class VII.

	£.
Temporary Commissions	25,000
Miscellaneous Expenses	16,087
Repayments to the Local Loans Fund	—
St. Louis Exhibition, 1904	—
Total for Civil Services	£13,035,000

Revenue Departments.

	£
Customs	350,000
Inland Revenue	830,000
Post Office	3,800,000
Post Office Packet Service	250,000
Post Office Telegraphs	2,000,000
Total for Revenue Departments	£7,230,000
Grand Total	£20,265,000

Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) ... 1240
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) ... 1242
Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.) ... 1248
Mr. Black (Banffshire) ... 1249
Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil) ... 1252
Mr. Peel (Manchester, S.) ... 1254
Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.) ... 1259
Sir Robert Reid (Dumfries Burghs) ... 1259
Mr. J. Chamberlain ... 1260
Mr. Whiteley (Halifax) ... 1263
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) ... 1267
Mr. J. Chamberlain ... 1271
Mr. Labouchere (Northampton) ... 1284
Sir John Leng (Dundee) ... 1288
Mr. Bryn Roberts (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) ... 1289
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) ... 1292

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item, Class 4, Vote 1 (Board of Education), be reduced by £100."—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) ... 1297
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) ... 1300
Mr. John Burns (Battersea) ... 1303

The hon. Member was still speaking when the House adjourned.

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

London United Tramways Bill [By Order].—[Second Reading.]

Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) ... 1304

Mar. 19.]

	Page
Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.)	1306
Mr. John Burns (Battersea)	1306

Read a second time, and committed.

SUPPLY [2ND ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

CIVIL SERVICE AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1903–4 (VOTE ON ACCOUNT).—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £20,265,000, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for or towards defraying the charges for the following Civil Service and Revenue Departments for the year ending 31st March, viz. :—

Civil Services.

CLASS II.

	£.
Colonial Office	25,000

CLASS IV.

Board of Education	6,000,000

CLASS II.

Board of Agriculture	65,000

CLASS III.

Crofters Commission, Scotland	2,000

CLASS I.

Royal Palaces and Marlborough House	40,000
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens	50,000
Houses of Parliament Buildings	16,000
Miscellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain	30,000
Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain	20,000
Diplomatic and Consular Buildings	18,000
Revenue Buildings	225,000
Public Buildings, Great Britain	225,000
Surveys of the United Kingdom	90,000
Harbours under the Board of Trade	7,000
Peterhead Harbour	6,000
Rates on Government Property	250,000
Public Works and Buildings, Ireland	110,000
Railways, Ireland	80,000

CLASS II.

United Kingdom and England :—

House of Lords Offices	2,000
House of Commons Offices	12,000
Treasury and Subordinate Departments	40,000
Home Office	60,000
Foreign Office	30,000
Privy Council Office, &c.	5,000

	£.
Board of Trade	75,000
Mercantile Marine Services	30,000
Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade ...	3
Charity Commission	15,000
Civil Service Commission	18,000
Exchequer and Audit Department	25,000
Friendly Societies Registry	3,000
Local Government Board...	85,000
Lunacy Commission	5,000
Mint (including Coinage)	5
National Debt Office	6,000
Public Record Office	10,000
Public Works Loan Commission	5
Registrar General's Office	19,000
Stationery and Printing	320,000
Woods, Forests, &c., Office of	8,000
Works and Public Buildings, Office of	30,000
Secret Service	40,000
Scotland :—	
Secretary for Scotland	25,000
Fishery Board	8,000
Lunacy Commission	3,000
Registrar-General's Office	5,000
Local Government Board...	6,000
Ireland :—	
Lord Lieutenant's Household	2,000
Chief Secretary for Ireland	16,000
Department of Agriculture	75,000
Charitable Donations and Bequests Office	1,000
Local Government Board	25,000
Public Record Office	2,000
Public Works Office	18,000
Registrar-General's Office	6,000
Valuation and Boundary Survey...	7,000

CLASS III.

United Kingdom and England :—	
Law Charges	35,000
Miscellaneous Legal Expenses	27,000
Supreme Court of Judicature	140,000
Land Registry	20,000
County Courts	8,000
Police, England and Wales	18,000
Prisons, England and the Colonies	340,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain ...	140,000
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum	14,000
Scotland :—	
Law Charges and Courts of Law...	30,000
Register House, Edinburgh	15,000
Prisons, Scotland	40,000
Ireland :—	
Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions	35,000
Supreme Court of Judicature, and other Legal Departments	45,000
Land Commission	55,000

Mar. 19.] Page

	£.
County Court Officers, &c.	46,000
Dublin Metropolitan Police	45,000
Royal Irish Constabulary	600,000
Prisons, Ireland	50,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools	55,000
Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum	3,000
CLASS IV.	
United Kingdom and England:—	
British Museum	80,000
National Gallery	10,000
National Portrait Gallery	3,000
Wallace Collection	4,000
Scientific Investigation, &c., United Kingdom	22,000
Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales	42,000
Scotland:—	
Public Education	750,000
National Gallery	3,000
Ireland:—	
Public Education	730,000
Endowed Schools Commissioners	400
National Gallery	3,000
Queen's Colleges	2,500
CLASS V.	
Diplomatic and Consular Services	250,000
Uganda, Central and East Africa Protectorates, and Uganda Railway	320,000
Colonial Services	300,000
Cyprus, Grant in Aid	85,000
Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable	32,000
CLASS VI.	
Superannuation and Retired Allowances	280,000
Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, &c.	2,000
Miscellaneous Charitable and Other Allowances	1,000
Hospitals and Charities, Ireland	17,000
CLASS VII.	
Temporary Commissions	25,000
Miscellaneous Expenses	16,087
Repayments to the Local Loans Fund	--
St. Louis Exhibition, 1904	—
Total for Civil Services	£13,035,000
Revenue Departments:—	
Customs	350,000
Inland Revenue	830,000
Post Office	3,800,000
Post Office Packet Service	250,000
Post Office Telegraphs	2,000,000
Total for Revenue Departments	£7,230,000
Grand Total	£20,265 000

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item, Class 4, Vote 1 (Board of Education) be reduced by £100."—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Mr. John Burns 1310
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (*Somersetshire, E.*) 1311
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*) 1313
Mr. Shaw-Stewart (*Renfrew, E.*) 1316
Mr. Levy (*Leicestershire, Loughborough*) 1316
Mr. Arkwright (*Hereford*) 1319
Mr. Yoxall (*Nottingham, W.*) 1320
Mr. M'Kenna (*Monmouthshire, N.*) 1322
Col. Williams (*Dorsetshire, W.*) 1324
The Secretary to the Board of Education (*Sir William Anson, Oxford University*) 1325

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Helme (*Lancashire, Lancaster*) 1332
Mr. Layland-Barratt (*Devonshire, Torquay*) 1333
Sir William Anson 1333
Mr. Weir (*Ross and Cromarty*) 1334
The Lord Advocate (*Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire*) 1335
Sir Edward Strachey (*Somersetshire, E.*) 1337
The President of the Board of Agriculture (*Mr. Hanbury, Preston*) ... 1338
Mr. Spear (*Devonshire, Tavistock*) 1339

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman proceeded, in pursuance of Standing Order 15, to put the Question necessary to dispose of the Vote.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next: Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

1. Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the years ending on the 31st day of March, 1902 and 1903, the sum of £1,520,704 15s. 5d. be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

2. Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904, the sum of £38,997,200 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

Adjourned at six minutes after Twelve o'clock.

Mar. 20.] *Page*

HOUSE OF LORDS : FRIDAY, 20TH MARCH, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Maryport Harbour Bill [H.L.], Committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Nantwich Urban District Council Bill [H.L.], Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table: The orders made on the 9th and 12th instant discharged; and Bill committed for Tuesday next 1341

PETITIONS.

SHOPS (EARLY CLOSING) BILL [H.L.].—Petition in favour of: of Glasgow Corporation; read, and ordered to lie on the Table... 1341

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CROFTER HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACTS, 1886–87.—Report by the Crofters Commission, being for the year ended 31st December, 1902: Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table 1341

POLLING DISTRICTS (WEST RIDING OF THE COUNTY OF YORK).—Order made by the County Council of the West Riding of the County of York, altering certain polling districts in the Shipley, Sowerby, Holmfirth, and Morley Parliamentary Divisions 1341

PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1881 (ORDERS).—Two Orders in Council, dated 16th March, 1903, with respect to the importation of arms and ammunition, for the purpose of adding Arklow to the ports at which explosives may be landed.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1341

Shops (Early Closing) Bill [H.L.].—Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

Moved, that the House do now resolve itself into Committee on this Bill.—(*Lord Avebury.*)

The Earl of Wemyss 1342
Earl Cowper 1343
Lord Avebury 1346

On Question, agreed to; House in Committee (according to order).

Clause 1:—

Lord Ribblesdale 1348

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 9, to leave out from 'application' to 'them' in line 11."—(*Lord Ribblesdale.*)

Lord Avebury 1350
Lord Monkswell 1351

Mar. 20.] Page

The Earl of Portsmouth 1352
Lord Davey 1352
The Lord Chancellor (The Earl of Halsbury) 1352
The Lord Bishop of Rochester 1353
Lord Avebury 1353
Lord Belper 1354
Earl Spencer 1355
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1355
Lord Burghclere 1356
The Earl of Halsbury 1356

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Their Lordships divided: Contents, 57; Not-Contents, 21.

Lord Belper 1357

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, line 20, to leave out sub-section (3)."—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Lytton 1358

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 1, and to insert the following new Clause: (1) 'The local authority, as hereinafter defined, after giving notice and holding an inquiry, may establish such regulations as from time to time shall appear to them necessary with regard to the closing of shops and the limitation of the hours of the shop workers within the area under their jurisdiction; (2) Provided that, save as otherwise expressly provided in this Act, such regulations shall not apply to shops belonging to any of the classes mentioned in the Schedule of this Act.'"—(*The Earl of Lytton.*)

Lord Avebury 1360
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1361
Lord Belper... 1361

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Lord Belper 1362

Amendment moved—

"To insert as a new clause: 'Where any shop is carried on by two or more persons in partnership, they shall be counted for the purposes of this section and of Section 3 as a single occupier.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2:—

Lord Ribblesdale 1362

Mar. 20.] *Page*

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 2, line 16, to leave out 'may' and to insert 'shall.'"—(*Lord Ribblesdale.*)

Lord Belper 1363

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clause 4 :

Lord Belper 1363

Amendment moved :

"To leave out Clause 4."—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 5 :

Lord Belper 1364

Amendment moved :

"To leave out Clause 5, and to insert the following new clause—(1) Nothing in this Act or in any order made thereunder shall apply to any shop in which the only trade carried on is one of the trades specified in the schedule. (2) A shop in which two or more trades are carried on shall be closed for the purpose of all such trades at the hour at which it is by any order under this Act required to be closed for the purpose of any of them : Provided that if any such trade is carried on solely in a part of the shop structurally separate from the rest of the shop, it shall be deemed to be carried on in a separate shop."—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 6 and 7 agreed to.

Clause 8 :

Lord Belper 1365

Amendment moved :

"In Clause 8, page 3, to leave out Sub-section 3 and to insert as a new sub-section the provisions of the Shops Hour Acts, 1892 and 1893, with regard to the appointment, powers, and salaries of inspectors shall be deemed to apply for the purposes of this Act."—(*Lord Belper.*)

Lord Avebury 1365

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 8, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 9 to 11 agreed to.

Page

Clause 12 :—

Lord Belper 1366

Amendment moved :

"To leave out Clause 12."—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 13 :

The Secretary for Scotland (*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*)... 1366

Clause 13 agreed to.

Clause 14 agreed to.

Clause 15 :

Lord Avebury 1366
Lord Belper 1366

Consequential Amendment agreed to,

Clause 15, as amended, agreed to.

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended.

Light Locomotives (Ireland) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order).

Clause 1 :

The President of the Board of Education (*The Marquess of Londonderry*) 1367

Amendments moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 6, after the second 'any' to insert 'public'"; "in line 10, to leave out 'may' and to insert 'shall,' and to leave out from 'as' to 'for' in line 11, and to insert 'may be required by the Local Government Board for Ireland'"; "in line 15, at the beginning of paragraph (3) to insert 'such,' and after 'notice' to insert 'as may be required by the Local Government Board for Ireland'"; "in line 16, to leave out from 'order' to end of the paragraph."—(*The Marquess of Londonderry.*)

The Marquess of Granby 1367

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining Clauses agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived: The Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next; and Bill to be printed as amended.

Mar. 20.] *Page*

Clause 1:

Lord Alverstone 1368

Amendment moved:

"In Clause 1, page 1, lines 5 and 6, to leave out 'and without the knowledge of his principal.'"—(*Lord Alverstone.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Alverstone 1368

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 9, after 'do' to insert 'or for having done or forborne to do.'"—(*Lord Alverstone.*)

The Earl of Halsbury 1369
Lord Alverstone 1369
Lord Davey 1369

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord James of Hereford 1369

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, line 12, after 'or' to insert 'if any person whose duty it is to order or receive goods on behalf of his principal, shall, in consequence of so doing receive any recompense or gift from the person supplying such goods without the knowledge of the principal or.'"—(*Lord James of Hereford.*)

Lord Burghclere 1370
Earl Spencer 1370
The Earl of Halsbury 1371
Lord Davey 1372
Viscount Goschen 1372
Lord James of Hereford 1373

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Lord Alverstone 1373

Amendments moved.

"In line 27, to leave out 'one year,' and insert 'two years'; in in line 28, after 'pounds,' to insert 'or to both such imprisonment and such fine'; and in line 30, after 'pounds,' to insert 'or to both such imprisonment and such fine.'"—(*Lord Alverstone.*)

On Question, Amendments agreed to.

The Earl of Halsbury 1374

Amendment moved.

"In Clause 1, page 2, after line 4, to insert '(3) A person serving under the Crown is an agent within the meaning of this Act.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Prevention of Corruption Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order).

The Earl of Halsbury 1374

Amendment moved.

"To insert '(4) In any prosecution under this Act evidence shall not be admissible to show that any such gift or consideration as is mentioned in this section is customary in any trade or calling.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord Davey 1374

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Halsbury 1375

Amendment moved—

"To insert (5) for the purposes of this Act, where it is shown that any such gift or consideration as in this section mentioned has been taken, given, or offered without the assent of the principal, the burden of proving that such gift or consideration was not taken, given, or offered corruptly shall lie on the accused."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord James of Hereford 1375

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Bill recommitted to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended.

Bank Holidays (Ireland) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next 1375

Marine Insurance Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment; and recommitted to the Standing Committee 1375

Shops (Hours of Closing) Bill [H.L.]. Bill (on Motion), by leave of the House, withdrawn 1376

THE FREE CHURCH COUNCIL AND THE EDUCATION ACT.

The Lord Bishop of Salisbury 1376
Lord Burghclere 1378
The President of the Board of Education (*The Marquess of Londonderry*) 1379

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Seven o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 20TH MARCH, 1903.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means ... 1381

Mar. 20.] *Page*

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Maidstone Gas Bill.—Petition for additional provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 1382

PETITIONS.

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.—Petition from Newcastle and Gateshead, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1382

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Farnell, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1382

LAND VALUES ASSESSMENT AND RATING BILL.—Petition from Manchester, in favour; to lie upon the Table... 1382

PADAIYACHI, VEERABADRA.—Petition from Veerabadra Padaiyachi, for inquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table 1382

PUBLIC HOUSES (HOURS OF CLOSING) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1382

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.—Petitions against: From Aylesbury; Camelford; Sheffield (two); Ventnor; Wivenhoe; Wells; Chard; Swansea; Sandgate; Cannock; Mining Association of Great Britain; Newtown and Llanidloes; Colchester; Hemsworth; Darfield; Royston; and Durham; to lie upon the Table 1382

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.—Petitions in favour; From Nottingham; and Manchester; to lie upon the Table 1382

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.—Petitions against establishment: From Benhar Moor; Dumbarton; and Rothesay; to lie upon the Table ... 1382

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Romsey; and Wimbledon; to lie upon the Table 1383

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1881 (ORDERS).—Copies presented, of two Orders in Council, dated 16th March, 1903, with respect to the importation of arms and ammunition for the purpose of adding Arklow to the ports at which explosives may be landed [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1383

POLLING DISTRICTS (WEST RIDING OF THE COUNTY OF YORK).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the West Riding of the county of York altering certain polling districts in the Shipley, Sowerby, Holmfirth, and Morley Parliamentary Divisions [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1383

CROFTERS' HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACTS.—Copy presented, of Report of the Crofters' Commission for the year 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1383

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

PUBLIC WORSHIP REGULATION AND CHURCH DISCIPLINE.—Question, Mr. Heywood Johnstone (Sussex, Horsham); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas ... 1383

VOLUNTEERS—NEW MUSKETRY REGULATIONS.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1384

ARMY ESTIMATES—APPENDICES.—Question, Capt. Sinclair (Forfarshire); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1384

SANDHURST MILITARY CADETS—COST OF SECOND YEAR'S TRAINING.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick ... 1384

CONTRACTS FOR AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS FOR SOUTH AFRICA—BRITISH AND FOREIGN TENDERERS.—Question, Mr. Norman (Wolverhampton, S.); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1385

Rating of Machinery Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Chapman (Cheshire, Hyde) 1385

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil) 1389

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. D. A. Thomas.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Sir James Joicey (Durham, Chester-le-Street) 1395
Sir William Houldsworth (Manchester, N.W.) 1398
Mr. Ure (Linlithgowshire) 1401
Mr. Cripps (Lancashire, Stretford) 1402
Sir William Allan (Gateshead) 1405
Sir Samuel Hoare (Norwich) 1408
Mr. Lawson Walton (Leeds, S.) 1410
Mr. Barran (Leeds, N.) 1414
Sir John Rolleston (Leicester) 1415
Mr. John Wilson (Durham, Mid) 1416
Col. Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport) 1418
Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire)... 1421
The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Grant Lawson, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 1423
Mr. Groves (Salford, S.) 1427
Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam) 1427
Mr. Henry Wilson (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth) 1428
Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green) 1428
Mr. Crean (Cork, S.E.) 1429

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 157; Noes, 119. (Division List No. 38.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Friday, 15th May.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 23RD MARCH, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Bill [H.L.]; a witness ordered to attend the Select Committee.

Mar. 23.] *Page*

Macclesfield and District Electric Tramways Bill [H.L.]; read 2^a (according to order).

South Staffordshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Hove, Worthing, and District Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Chatham and District Light Railways Bill [H.L]; Mid Yorkshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; committed: the Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

South Lancashire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Preston and Horwich Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Southern Tramways (Lancashire) Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Southern Tramways (Cheshire) Bill [H.L.]; Derby Gas Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Bill [H.L.]; North Cheshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; committed: the Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Shepshed Urban District Gas Bill [H.L.]; committed.

Plymouth and Stonehouse Gas Bill [H.L.]; reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Cleveland and Durham County Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Report from the Select Committee, "That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 12th instant discharged; and Bill committed for Thursday next... 1433

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOAN FUND BOARD OF IRELAND.—Sixty-fifth Annual Report, 1902; Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table 1433

SUPERANNUATION.—Treasury Minute, dated 18th March, 1903, declaring that William Barber, artificer, Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his department. Laid before the House [pursuant to Act 1, and ordered to lie on the Table 1433

BRIDLINGTON PIERS AND HARBOUR.—Abstract of the Annual General Account, for the year ended 26th July, 1902. Delivered [pursuant to Act], and ordered to lie on the Table 1434

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION FOR THE STANDING COMMITTEE.—Report from, That the Committee have nominated the following Lords to serve as Chairmen of the Standing Committee:

E. Spencer.
E. Morley.
E. Camperdown.
V. Cross.
L. Balfour.
L. Elgin (*E. Elgin and Kincardine*).
L. Burghclere.

Read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1434

STANDING COMMITTEE.—Report from the Committee of Chairmen of the Standing Committee, that they have appointed Viscount Cross Chairman of the Standing Committee; read, and ordered to lie on the Table ... 1434

STANDING COMMITTEE.—To meet to-morrow at Four o'clock 1434

Light Locomotives (Ireland) Bill.—Amendments reported [according to order], and Bill to be read 3^a to-morrow 1434

Bank Holidays (Ireland) Bill.—Read 3ª [according to order], and passed 1434

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 23RD MARCH, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means ... 1434

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the first Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz. :—

West Cumberland Electric Tramways Bill.
South Yorkshire Joint Railways Bill.

Ordered, that the Bills be read a second time 1435

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time to-morrow 1435

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH.)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time to-morrow 1435

Dublin Improvement (Bull Alley Area) Bill; Great Western Railway (Pension Fund) Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Croydon and District Electric Tramways Bill; Great Central Railway Bill; Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway Bill; South Shields, Sunderland, and District Tramways Bill.—Read a second time, and committed 1435

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP B).—Ordered, That Samuel Frederick Andrews do attend the Committee on Group B of Private Bills to-morrow at Twelve of the Clock 1436

Wellingborough and District Tramroads Bill.—Read a second time, and committed 1436

POLICE AND SANITARY REGULATIONS.

Ordered, That the Committee of Selection do nominate a Committee not exceeding eleven members, to be called the Police and Sanitary

Committee, to whom shall be committed all Private Bills promoted by Municipal and other local authorities by which it is proposed to create powers relating to police or sanitary regulations in conflict with, deviation from, or excess of the provisions of the general law.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 150 and 173A apply to all such Bills.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That four be the quorum of the Committee.

Ordered, That if the Committee consider that any Clauses of any Bill referred to them (other than Clauses containing Police and Sanitary Regulations) are such as, having regard to the terms of the reference to the Committee, it is not necessary or advisable for them to deal with, they may at any time make a Special Report to the Committee of Selection to that effect, and the Committee of Selection shall then refer the Bill to a Select Committee, who shall consider those Clauses and the Preamble and report the whole Bill to the House, specifying in their Report which Clauses have been considered by the Police and Sanitary Committee, and which Clauses have been considered by the Select Committee.

Ordered, That the Committee have power, if they so determine, to sit as two Committees, and in that event to apportion the Bills referred to the Committee between the two Committees, each of which shall have the full powers of, and be subject to, the instructions which apply to the undivided Committee; and that three be the quorum of each of the two Committees.—(*Mr. Cochrane.*) 1436

PETITIONS.

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Cheltenham; Scottish Trade Protection Society; Norwich; Manchester; Bradford; Eastbourne; and Wakefield; to lie upon the Table 1436

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour; from New Spynie; and Brechin; to lie upon the Table 1436

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Montrose, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1436

PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF RIVERS AND STREAMS BILL.—Petition from Montrose, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1436

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.—Petitions against: from Leeds; Woolwich; Dolgelly; and Headington; to lie upon the Table 1436

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.—Petition from Montrose, against establishment; to lie upon the Table 1437

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Altrincham; and Lincoln; to lie upon the Table 1437

TOWN COUNCILS (SCOTLAND).—Petition from Montrose, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 1438

RETURN, REPORTS, ETC.

LOAN FUND BOARD (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Sixty-fifth Annual Report, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1438

Mar. 23.] *Page*

Railways Abandonment.—Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade respecting the Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill and the objects thereof [pursuant to Standing Order 158A]; referred to the Committee on the Bill 1438

Superannuation Act, 1884.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 18th March, 1903, declaring that William Barber, Artificer, Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1438

Public Accounts (Navy Notes).—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 18th March, 1903, authorising the temporary application of surpluses on certain Navy Votes for the year 1902–3 to meet excesses on other Navy Votes for the same year [pursuant to Resolution of the House of 4th March, 1879]; to lie upon the Table 1438

Aliens.—Return presented, relative thereto [Address, 6th March; *Mr. Cochrane*]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. (No. 86) 1438

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House:—

Bridlington Piers and Harbour.—Copy of Abstract of the General Annual Account for the year ending 26th July, 1902 [by Act] 1438

Deaths from Starvation or Accelerated Privation (London).—Address for "Return of the number of all deaths in the administrative county of London, in the year 1902, upon which a coroner's jury has returned a verdict of death from starvation or death accelerated by privation; together with any observations furnished to the Local Government Board by Boards of Guardians with references to cases included in the Return (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 342, of Session 1902)."—(*Mr Talbot*) 1438

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Waltham Abbey Sanitary Inspector—Visits to Government Property.—Question, Col. Lockwood (Essex, Epping); Answer, Mr. Brodrick... ... 1439

Dewsbury Post Office—Improved Sanitary Accommodation.—Question, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1439

British South Africa—Forced Labour.—Question, Mr. Levy (Leicestershire, Loughborough); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1440

Judicial Trustees.—Question, Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 1440

Trees in Phœnix Park—Damage by Storm.—Question, Mr. Healy (Louth, N.); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 1440

Promotion for Naval Schoolmasters.—Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1442

Plumbers in the Navy—Rates of Pay.—Question, Mr. Kearley (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1442

Naval Shooting—Names of Prize Winners.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1443

Mar. 23.] Page

NAVY RATIONS—IMPROVEMENT IN COOKING.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1443

PRIVATE PATHS IN CHATHAM DOCKYARD. — Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1443

GLASS BALLS ON MASTHEADS OF MEN-OF-WAR.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster... 1444

SPECIAL GREENWICH HOSPITAL PENSIONS. –Question, Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, E. R., Holderness); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1444

PROMOTION AND PAY IN THE NAVAL MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1444

NEW VICTUALLING SCHEME—INCREASED ALLOWANCE TO PENSIONERS.—Question, Mr. Lockie (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster ... 1445

NAVAL WORKS ACTS—EXPENDITURE.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1445

EDUCATION ACT, 1902—APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTION 11 (I.)—Question, Mr. Yoxall; Answer, Sir William Anson 1446

TRAINING COLLEGES—PRACTICAL EXAMINATION IN SCIENCE.—Question, Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.); Answer, Sir William Anson ... 1446

EDUCATION ACT, 1902—PAYMENT OF GRANTS BY INSTALMENTS.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, Sir William Anson 1447

EDUCATION ACT, 1902—SECTION 18 (I.) (*d.*)—Question, Mr. Henry Hobhouse; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1447

CONVICTIONS FOR ILLEGAL TRAWLING IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1448

DISTRESS IN SOUTH UIST.—Question, Mr. John Dewar (Inverness); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1448

PUBLIC HOUSE LICENCES.—Question, Lord Edmund Talbot (Sussex, Chichester); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 1449

CHIEF JUDGE OF LOWER BURMA—QUALIFICATIONS.—Question, Mr. Moon (St. Pancras, N.); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 1450

INDIA—CASE OF CAPTAIN WINTER.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 1450

DOGS SOLD BY THE POLICE.—Question, Dr. Shipman (Northampton); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1451

SOUTH AFRICA—IMPORTATION OF LABOUR.—Question, Mr. Labouchere (Northampton); Answer, Lord Cranborne 1451

ENGLISH SHAREHOLDERS IN FOREIGN UNDERTAKINGS. — Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Lord Cranborne 1451

BRITISH COALING STATIONS IN TRIPOLI.—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Lord Cranborne 1452

CANAL RATES IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Kennedy (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1452

EDUCATION IN IRELAND—GRANT.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1453

TRAINING OF VOLUNTEERS- ARTILLERY.—Question, Mr. Samuel Roberts, (Sheffield, Ecclesall); Answer, Mr. Brodrick... 1453

MEAT CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. Alfred Davies; Answer, Mr. Brodrick ... 1453

MAP OF SOMALILAND IN TEA ROOM.—Question, Mr. Round (Essex, Harwich); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1454

ROYAL ARTILLERY COMMISSIONS FOR UNIVERSITY CANDIDATES.—Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1454

MILITARY WORKS ACTS—EXPENDITURE.—Question, Mr. Buchanan; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1454

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

FLOGGING OF A DRUMMER BOY IN THE GUARDS.—Question, Mr. O'Mara (Kilkenny, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1454

CIVIL SERVICE CLERKS IN THE WAR OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1456

DRAFTS FOR SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1456

RANGE FINDERS.—Question, Mr. Orr-Ewing (Ayr Burghs); Answer, Lord Stanley 1457

ARMY WORKS BILL.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1457

ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE.—Question, Mr. Black (Banffshire); Answer, Lord Stanley... 1457

COASTGUARD SIGNAL STATIONS—WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 1457

OSBORNE NAVAL COLLEGE.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1458

NEW ADMIRALTY YACHT.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles and Sir William Allan; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1459

ALASKAN BOUNDARY TRIBUNAL.—Question, Mr. Rose (Cambridgeshire, Newmarket); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 1459

JAMAICA FINANCES.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1460

BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 1461

Mar. 23.] *Page*

CRETAN ADMINISTRATION.—Question, Mr. Stevenson (Suffolk, Eye); Answer, Lord Cranborne 1461

MACEDONIAN REFORMS.—Question, Mr. Stevenson; Answer, Lord Cranborne 1461

PORTUGUESE IMPORT DUTIES.—Question, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough); Answer, Lord Cranborne 1462

INTERNATIONAL MERCANTILE MARINE COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 1462

CORN TAX—EXPORT OF OFFALS.—Question, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, E.); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 1463

IDENTIFICATION OF MOTOR CARS.—Question, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, W.) 1463

LONDON TELEGRAPH SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 1464

LICENSED PREMISES.—Question, Mr. D. A. Morgan (Essex, Walthamstow); Answer, The Under Secretary of State to the Home Department (Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.) 1464

SHREWSBURY MUNICIPAL ELECTION PETITION.—Question, Mr. Lawson Walton (Leeds, S.); Answer, The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 1465

COUNTY JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.—Question, Sir Edward Strachey; Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 1465

LABOUR LEGISLATION AND TRADE COMBINATION.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Sir Fortescue Flannery (Yorkshire, W.R., Shipley) 1466

BIRDCAGE WALK.—Question, Mr. Kearley (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey)... 1466

CHURCH STREET, KENSINGTON.—Question, Dr. Farquharson; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hayes Fisher, Fulham) 1467

ROXBORO' ROAD SCHOOL, LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1467

IRISH TEACHERS—CAPITATION GRANT.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1467

LABOURERS' COTTAGE SCHEME.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork Co., Mid.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1468

NORTH DUBLIN FISHERIES.—Question, Mr. Clancy (Dublin Co., N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1468

FITZMAURICE ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1468

Mar. 23.] Page

TEMPLEMORE DISTURBANCES.—Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien (Tipperary, Mid); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1469

PROMOTION IN THE DUBLIN SORTING OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Nannetti; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1469

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 1470

WAYS AND MEANS.

Ordered, That the Proceedings on the Report from the Committee of Ways and Means be not interrupted this evening under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House), and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed.—(*Mr. Balfour*) 1470

SUPPLY [16TH MARCH]—REPORT.

Resolution reported.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

"That 127,100 men and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904, including 19,806 Royal Marines."

Resolution read a second time.

Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 1470
Mr. Labouchere (Northampton) 1476

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out '127,100,' and insert '122,500.'"—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Resolution."

Sir Fortescue Flannery (Yorkshire, Shipley) 1481
Sir Robert Reid (Dumfries Burghs) 1483
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 1487
Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury) 1491
The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) ... 1493
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee)... 1498

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth)... 1501
Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs) 1502
Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth) 1503
Sir William Allan (Gateshead) 1507
Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth) 1508
Mr. Kearley (Devonport) 1510
Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.) 1512

Resolution agreed to.

Ordered, That the Resolution which, upon the 18th day of this instant March, was reported from the Committee of Supply, and which was then agreed to by the House, be now read.

Mar. 23.] *Page*

"That a number of Land Forces, not exceeding 235,761, all ranks, be maintained for the Service of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland at Home and Abroad, excluding his Majesty's Indian Possessions, during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

Ordered, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to provide, during twelve months, for the Discipline and Regulation of the Army; and that Mr. Secretary Brodrick, Mr. Arnold-Forster, and Lord Stanley do prepare and bring it in.

Army (Annual) Bill.—"To provide, during twelve months, for the Discipline and Regulation of the Army," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 114.] 1513

SUPPLY [17TH MARCH].

Order read, for further consideration of second Resolution 1513

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

"That a sum, not exceeding £6,312,800, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the expenses of wages, etc., to officers, seamen and boys, Coast Guard and Royal Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1904" 1513

Mr. Arnold-Forster 1513

Resolution agreed to.

SUPPLY [18TH MARCH]—REPORT.

Resolutions reported.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £784,300, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the expense of half-pay, reserved, and retired pay, to officers of the Navy and Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £350,100, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the expense of civil pensions and gratuities, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

Resolutions agreed to 1514

SUPPLY [19TH MARCH]—REPORT.

Resolution reported.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1903–4 (VOTE ON ACCOUNT).

"That a sum, not exceeding £20,265,000, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for or towards defraying the charges for the following Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904, viz.:—

Mar. 23.] *Page*

Civil Services.

Class II

	£
Colonial Office	25,000

Class IV.

Board of Education	6,000,000

Class II.

Board of Agriculture	65,000

Class III.

Crofters Commission, Scotland	2,000

Class I.

Royal Palaces and Marlborough House	40,000
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens	50,000
Houses of Parliament Buildings	16,000
Miscellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain	30,000
Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain	20,000
Diplomatic and Consular Buildings	18,000
Revenue Buildings	225,000
Public Buildings, Great Britain	225,000
Surveys of the United Kingdom	90,000
Harbours under the Board of Trade	7,000
Peterhead Harbour	6,000
Rates on Government Property	250,000
Public Works and Buildings, Ireland	110,000
Railways, Ireland	80,000

Class II.

United Kingdom and England :—

House of Lords Offices	2,000
House of Commons Offices	12,000
Treasury and Subordinate Departments	40,000
Home Office	60,000
Foreign Office	30,000
Privy Council Office, &c.	5,000
Board of Trade	75,000
Mercantile Marine Services	30,000
Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade	3
Charity Commission	15,000
Civil Service Commission	18,000
Exchequer and Audit Department	25,000
Friendly Societies Registry	3,000
Local Government Board	85,000
Lunacy Commission	5,000
Mint (including Coinage)	5
National Debt Office	6,000
Public Record Office	10,000
Public Works Loan Commission	5
Registrar-General's Office	19,000
Stationery and Printing	320,000
Woods, Forests, &c., Office of	8,000
Works and Public Buildings, Office of	30,000
Secret Service	40,000

Mar. 23.] Page

Scotland :—

	£.
Secretary for Scotland	25,000
Fishery Board	8,000
Lunacy Commission	3,000
Registrar-General's Office	5,000
Local Government Board	6,000

Ireland :—

Lord Lieutenant's Household	2,000
Chief Secretary for Ireland	16,000
Department of Agriculture	75,000
Charitable Donations and Bequests Office	1,000
Local Government Board	25,000
Public Record Office	2,000
Public Works Office	18,000
Registrar General's Office	6,000
Valuation and Boundary Survey	7,000

CLASS III.

United Kingdom and England :—

Law Charges	35,000
Miscellaneous Legal Expenses	27,000
Supreme Court of Judicature	140,000
Land Registry	20,000
County Courts	8,000
Police, England and Wales	18,000
Prisons, England and the Colonies	340,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain	140,000
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum	14,000

Scotland :—

Law Charges and Courts of Law	30,000
Register House, Edinburgh	15,000
Prisons, Scotland	40,000

Ireland :—

Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions	35,000
Supreme Court of Judicature, and other Legal Departments	45,000
Land Commission	55,000
County Court Officers, &c.	46,000
Dublin Metropolitan Police	45,000
Royal Irish Constabulary	600,000
Prisons, Ireland	50,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools	55,000
Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum	3,000

CLASS IV.

United Kingdom and England :—

British Museum	80,000
National Gallery	10,000
National Portrait Gallery	3,000
Wallace Collection	4,000
Scientific Investigation, &c., United Kingdom	22,000
Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales	42,000

	£.
Scotland :—	
Public Education	750,000
National Gallery	3,000
Ireland :—	
Public Education	730,000
Endowed Schools Commissioners	400
National Gallery	3,000
Queen's Colleges	2,500
CLASS V.	
Diplomatic and Consular Services	250,000
Uganda, Central and East Africa Protectorates, and Uganda Railway	320,000
Colonial Services	300,000
Cyprus, Grant in Aid	85,000
Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable	32,000
CLASS VI.	
Superannuation and Retired Allowances	280,000
Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, etc.	2,000
Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances	1,000
Hospitals and Charities, Ireland	17,000
Savings Bank and Friendly Societies Deficiencies	— —
CLASS VII.	
Temporary Commissions	25,000
Miscellaneous Expenses	16,087
Repayments to the Local Loans Fund	— —
St. Louis Exhibition, 1904	— —
Total for Civil Services	£13,035,000
Revenue Departments :—	
Customs	350,000
Inland Revenue	830,000
Post Office	3,800,000
Post Office Packet Service	250,000
Post Office Telegraphs	2,000,000
Total for Revenue Departments	£7,230,000
Grand Total	£20,265,000

Resolution read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.) ... 1518
Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) ... 1519
Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple) ... 1519
Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) ... 1520
Mr. Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Fareham) ... 1522
Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) ... 1522
The President of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) ... 1523
Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) ... 1526
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hayes Fisher, Fulham) 1528

Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil) 1529
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 1532
Mr. John Dewar (Inverness-shire) 1534
The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 1534
Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland) 1536

And, it being half-past Seven of the Clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [BY ORDER].
[SECOND READING]—Order for Second Reading read.

Sir Frederick Banbury (Camberwell, Peckham)... 1537
Sir J. Blundell Maple (Camberwell, Dulwich) 1537

The Bill was read a second time, and committed.

Midland and Belfast and Northern Counties Railways Bill [BY ORDER].
[SECOND READING.] Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.) 1538

Amendment proposed.

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. MacVeagh.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Sir Charles Renshaw (Renfrewshire) 1540
Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.) 1540
Col. M'Calmont (Antrim, E.) 1442
Mr. Conor O'Kelly (Mayo, N.) 1542
The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) ... 1542
Mr. Hemphill (Tyrone, N.) 1543
Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) 1543

The Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill read a second time.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill [BY ORDER].

Sir Frederick Banbury 1545
Sir William Tomlinson (Preston)... 1547

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the London County Council (General Powers) Bill to omit Clauses 63 and 64."—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

Mr. John Burns (Battersea) 1547
Sir J. Blundell Maple (Camberwell, Dulwich) 1551
Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple) 1551

Mr. Whitmore (Chelsea) 1552
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.)... 1553
Mr. Burdett-Coutts (Westminster)... 1554

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 126 ; Noes, 109. (Division List No. 39.)

SUPPLY [19TH MARCH].

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [23rd March], "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the Resolution :— 'That a sum, not exceeding £20,265,000, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for or towards defraying the Charges for the following Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904,' " viz :—

CIVIL SERVICES.

CLASS II.

	£
Colonial Office	25,000

CLASS IV.

Board of Education	6,000,000

CLASS II.

Board of Agriculture	65,000

CLASS III.

Crofters Commission, Scotland	2,000

CLASS I.

Royal Palaces and Marlborough House	40,000
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens	50,000
Houses of Parliament Buildings	16,000
Micellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain	30,000
Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain	20,000
Diplomatic and Consular Buildings	18,000
Revenue Buildings	225,000
Public Buildings, Great Britain	225,000
Surveys of the United Kingdom...	90,000
Harbours under the Board of Trade	7,000
Peterhead Harbour	6,000
Rates on Government Property	250,000
Public Works and Buildings, Ireland	110,000
Railways, Ireland	80,000

CLASS II.

United Kindom and England :—

House of Lords Offices	2,000
House of Commons Offices	12,000
Treasury and Subordinate Departments...	40,000
Home Office	60,000
Foreign Office	30,000
Privy Council Office, &c.	5,000

Mar. 23.] *Page*

	£
Board of Trade	75,000
Mercantile Marine Services	30,000
Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade	3
Charity Commission	15,000
Civil Service Commission	18,000
Exchequer and Audit Department	25,000
Friendly Societies Registry	3,000
Local Government Board	85,000
Lunacy Commission	5,000
Mint (including Coinage)	5
National Debt Office	6,000
Public Record Office	10,000
Public Works Loan Commission	5
Registrar-General's Office	19,000
Stationery and Printing	320,000
Woods, Forests, &c., Office of	8,000
Works and Public Buildings, Office of	30,000
Secret Service	40,000
Scotland :—	
Secretary for Scotland	25,000
Fishery Board	8,000
Lunacy Commission	3,000
Registrar-General's Office	5,000
Local Government Board	6,000
Ireland :—	
Lord-Lieutenant's Household	2,000
Chief Secretary for Ireland	16,000
Department of Agriculture	75,000
Charitable Donations and Bequests Office	1,000
Local Government Board	25,000
Public Record Office	2,000
Public Works Office	18,000
Registrar-General's Office	6,000
Valuation and Boundary Survey	7,000

CLASS III.

United Kingdom and England :—	
Law Charges	35,000
Miscellaneous Legal Expenses	27,000
Supreme Court of Judicature	140,000
Land Registry	20,000
County Courts	8,000
Police, England and Wales	18,000
Prisons, England and the Colonies	340,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain	140,000
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum	14,000
Scotland :—	
Law Charges and Courts of Law	30,000
Register House, Edinburgh	15,000
Prisons, Scotland	40,000
Ireland :—	
Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions	35,000
Supreme Court of Judicature, and other Legal Departments	45,000
Land Commission	55,000

	£.
County Court Officers, etc.	46,000
Dublin Metropolitan Police	45,000
Royal Irish Constabulary	600,000
Prisons, Ireland	50,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools	55,000
Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum	3,000

CLASS IV.

	£.
United Kingdom and England :—	
British Museum	80,000
National Gallery	10,000
National Portrait Gallery	3,000
Wallace Collection	4,000
Scientific Investigation, etc., United Kingdom	22,000
Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales	42,000
Scotland :—	
Public Education	750,000
National Gallery	3,000
Ireland :—	
Public Education	730,000
Endowed Schools Commissioners	400
National Gallery	3,000
Queen's Colleges	2,500

CLASS V.

	£.
Diplomatic and Consular Services	250,000
Uganda, Central and East Africa Protectorates, and Uganda Railway	320,000
Colonial Services	300,000
Cyprus, Grant-in-Aid	85,000
Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable	32,000

CLASS VI.

	£.
Superannuation and Retired Allowances	280,000
Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, etc.	2,000
Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances	1,000
Hospitals and Charities, Ireland	17,000
Savings Banks and Friendly Societies Deficiencies	—

CLASS VII.

	£.
Temporary Commissions	25,000
Miscellaneous Expenses	16,087
Repayments to the Local Loans Fund	—
St. Louis Exhibition, 1904	—
Total for Civil Services	£13,035,000

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

	£.
Customs	350,000
Inland Revenue	830,000
Post Office	3,800,000
Post Office Packet Service	250,000
Post Office Telegraphs	2,000,000
Total for Revenue Departments	£7,230,000
Grand Total	£20,265,000

Mar. 23.] Page

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

Mr. Cathcart Wason 1560
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 1563
The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 1569
Mr. Stevenson (Suffolk, Eye) 1575

Question put, and agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS [19TH MARCH].—REPORT.

Resolutions reported.

1. "That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the years ending on the 31st day of March, 1902 and 1903, the sum of £1,520,704 15s. 5d. be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."
2. "That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904, the sum of £38,997,200 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."

Resolutions agreed to; Bill ordered to be brought in by The Deputy-Chairman, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Hayes Fisher.

Consolidated Fund (No. 1) Bill.—"To apply certain sums out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the years ending on the thirty-first day of March one thousand nine hundred and two, one thousand nine hundred and three, and one thousand nine hundred and four," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time this day.

Adjourned at two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOLUME CXIX.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

FOURTH SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE
United Kingdom of *GREAT BRITAIN* and *IRELAND*, in the
Third Year of the Reign of

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

SECOND VOLUME OF SESSION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 6*th March*, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

JEWISH COLONISATION ASSOCIATION.

Petition of the Jewish Colonisation Association, under their common seal, praying for leave to introduce a Bill to extend the powers of the Jewish Colonisation Association, and for other purposes, together with a copy of the proposed Bill annexed thereto; read, and referred to the Examiners.

Life Association of Scotland Bill [H.L.]. Milford Docks Bill [H.L.]. Indiarubber, Guttapercha, and Telegraph Works Company Bill [H.L.]. Lima Railways Bill [H.L.]. Sheffield and South Yorkshire Navigation Bill [H.L.].

Read 2^{a}.

MANCHESTER CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

Second Reading (which stands appointed for Monday next) put off to Monday the 16th instant.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY.

(Recruiting)—Annual Report of the Inspector-General of Recruiting, for the year 1902.

(Estimates) — Memorandum of the Secretary of State relating to the Army Estimates for 1903–1904.

Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 6*th March*, 1903.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of Fermanagh (North Fermanagh), in the room of Edward Mervyn Archdale, esquire (Chiltern Hundreds).—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILL (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz. :—

London Hydraulic Power Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 63 has been complied with, viz. :—

Blackheath and Greenwich District Electric Light Bill.

Market Drayton Gas Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILL (PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISION) (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for additional Provision in the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz. :—

Coventry Electric Tramways Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

PETITIONS.

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Pitsligo; Longside; Tyrie; Kilbarchan; and Kildalton; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1903-4 (VOTE ON ACCOUNT).

Estimate presented, showing the several Services for which a Vote on Account is required for the year ending 31st March, 1904 [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 58.]

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House—

INQUIRY INTO CHARITIES (COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY).

Further Return relative thereto [ordered 14th February, 1900; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to be printed. [No. 59.]

ALIENS.

Address for "Return showing the names of all aliens to whom certificates of naturalisation have been issued, and who have taken the oath of allegiance, between the first day of January, 1902, and the 31st day of December, 1902, giving the country and place of residence of the person naturalised, and including information as to any aliens who have, during the same period, obtained Acts of Naturalisation from the Legislature (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 184, of Session 1902)."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Congested Districts in Caithness.

Mr. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): To ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, whether the Congested Districts Board have received an application to declare the parish of Halkirk, Caithness, a congested district; and, if so, what decision they have come to in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The Parish Council of Halkirk, at the end of last year, applied to the Congested Districts Board asking that a portion of the parish should be declared a congested district. The Congested Districts Board, in reply, has asked for the information necessary to enable them to come to a decision, but no answer has as yet been received by the Board.

Report of Inspector of Factories—Return of Lead Poisoning.

Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when the first part of the Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops may be expected; and whether a Return of the analysed numbers of cases of lead poisoning in the potting industry, such as has been given annually for three years, is to be published in the present year without being moved for.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*) The Chief Inspector hopes that, if the printers are as prompt in their work as last year, the first part of his Annual Report will be ready for issue before the end of May. The Return of cases of lead poisoning has been moved for and will be published without delay.

Church Discipline—Prosecutions for Illegal Practices.

Mr. CUBITT (Surrey, Reigate): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a Return for the last ten years of cases in which application has been made to a bishop for leave to prosecute a clergyman for illegalities, and of the result of such applications.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*) I understand that the hon. Member refers to information such as that contained in a Return of Proceedings under the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, which was published in 1899. That Return carries the matter down to the year 1898, and I am prepared to have it continued to the end of last year.

Railways in West Africa—Shelford and Son, of London.

Mr. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Postmaster General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether the firm of Shelford and Son, London, received any commission, and, if so, how much, on the cost of the railways lately built, or at present under construction in West Africa.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain, for the Secretary of State for the Colonies.*) Messrs. Shelford and Son are remunerated for their services as consulting engineers by a salary from the funds of each Colony which employs them in that capacity, and their out-of-pocket expenses for office and clerks are refunded to them. They have not received any commission on the cost of the railways lately built or at present under construction in West Africa.

Uganda Railway—Crown Agents' Commission.

Mr. O'DOHERTY: To ask the Postmaster General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether the 1 per cent., which the Crown Agents were authorised to make on all supplies and materials shipped by them for the construction of the Uganda Railway, went to form a pension fund for the said agents and the other officials in the office; and, if not, to what expenses of the office was this percentage credited.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain, for the Secretary of State for the Colonies.*) The commission of 1 per cent. charged by the Crown Agents on the Uganda Railway supplies is credited, as received, to the Agents' Office Fund, like any other charges made against Colonial

Governments. From that fund are defrayed all the expenses of the Crown Agents' Office, and any annual balance to the credit of that fund is available for the increase of the reserve fund, which has been accumulated, as explained in the Secretary of State's Circular of 31st December 1863 (printed in C. 3075 of 1889), for certain purposes, including the provision of retiring pensions for the Crown Agents and their staff.

South African Constabulary—Compensation for Loss of Kit.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether the men of the South African Constabulary who lost their kit (civilian), which they had left behind them under orders, will be compensated for such loss.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain, for the Secretary of State for the Colonies.*) Men enlisted in this country were warned to take as little kit as possible, as railway transport could not be guaranteed. Many men, however, brought out large amounts. Surplus kit was stored at Capetown, at owner's risk, with private firms, and no liability for it was taken by the South African Constabulary. Compensation cannot, therefore, be allowed.

Uganda Railway—Engineers' Commission.

MR. O'DOHERTY: To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the consulting engineer or engineers who were employed on the construction of the Uganda Railway by the Foreign Office, or the Uganda Railway Committee, were paid any sum or sums by way of commission on the total cost of the works, or on materials supplied for the construction of said railway; and, if so, who were the engineers who were so remunerated, and the total amount received by each of them.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The answer to this Question is in the negative.

Alien Immigration.

MR. FORDE RIDLEY (Bethnal Green, S.W.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that a number of foreign emigrants from this country have been rejected by the shipping companies in Liverpool, on the ground that they would be classed as undesirables under the United States Immigration Laws; and can he say how many of the persons so rejected remain in this country.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I am informed by the shipping companies in Liverpool that the number of foreign emigrants rejected by them during 1902 on the ground that they would have been classed as undesirables under the United States Immigration Laws was about twenty-five, and that the whole of these persons were sent back to the Continent at the companies' expense.

Volunteer Resignations.

MR. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the figures of the Volunteer officers who have resigned their commissions since May, 1902, and also how many non-commissioned officers and men of the Volunteer force have retired during the same period.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The number of officers of the Volunteer force who have resigned since 1st May, 1902, is 713, compared with about 620 for twelve months in 1896–7 and 650 in 1897–8, when the establishment was 1,600 officers less. The number of non-commissioned officers and men can only be given between the 1st April, 1902, and 1st January, 1903, and amounts to 45,157, comparing with 52,000 for twelve months in 1897 and 1898. No further Returns will be received until next month.

INNKEEPERS' LIABILITY BILL.

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) said the Bill which he had the honour to introduce arose from an Amendment moved last session to the Licensing Bill by his hon. friend the Member for Leicester, which provided that any person holding a licence for the consumption of intoxicating liquor on the premises, who refused to supply a reasonable demand for refreshment, should be liable to a fine not exceeding 40s. for the first offence, and not exceeding £5 for the second offence. That Amendment was rejected in a full House by a majority of only nineteen votes, and its principle received a great deal of sympathy from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was then Secretary of State for the Home Department, and many other hon. Members, including the hon. Member for South Derby. The hon. Members who favoured the principle of the Bill consulted together, and that consultation resulted in the drafting of the present Bill, which was printed, but could not have been introduced last year.

MR. NOLAN (Louth, S.) called attention to the fact that forty Members were not present.

A count having been taken—

MR. SPEAKER: As only thirty-one Members are present, I will leave the Chair until a quorum is formed.

A quorum having been formed,

*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON, resuming, said the Bill was a small one, which did not propose a new law, but made it possible to enforce the present law. Under the common law, an innkeeper was obliged to provide accommodation and refreshment, and his hon. friend's Amendment would have extended that obligation to all holders of licences. It was, however, pointed out that licensed victuallers under the present law were not obliged to sell even intoxicating liquor; and hon. Members who opposed the Amendment last session pointed out that it was absurd to ask a man who was not obliged to sell anything at all, to sell an article he did not profess to sell. The promoters of the Bill saw the difficulty, and accepted the present Bill, which was limited to innkeepers, as a compromise, in the hope that it would have a moral effect which would be far-reaching. The difference between an innkeeper and a licensed victualler was somewhat subtle. An innkeeper was described by an Act passed in 1863 as a keeper of an inn, but it had been subsequently held that an innkeeper was a man who "holds out" accommodation to travellers who were willing to pay an adequate price for it, provided also that if required they should tender payment in advance. Some doubt existed as to the meaning of the words "holds out," but he presumed that if a man said that he provided accommodation for man and beast, he was clearly an innkeeper, and might be compelled to provide refreshments. He should like to abolish the distinction between a licensed victualler and an innkeeper, because a tavern which was simply a place where liquor was sold and where drinkers were entertained, seemed to him to be unnecessary. A movement was now in progress which had very high support, and which certainly had his sympathy, not to take drink between meals. He certainly should never think of taking drink between meals. But the Bill was not brought in in the interests of people who only wanted tea and bread and butter. There was a great improvement in late years in the small inns throughout the country, which was mainly due to cyclists. When he had to travel about the country on Committees of the County Council, he frequently stopped at a small inn when he wanted something to eat; and he believed nothing would tend more to sobriety than if they made licensed victuallers victuallers in fact as well as in name. A great many people took two, three, and four glasses of beer, when, if they could have bread and cheese also, they would only take one glass.

The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer last year said that the arguments in favour of the Amendment were largely drawn from personal experiences, and that, although such experiences were exceedingly valuable, an alteration of the law based on them would not be desirable in the present instance. He remembered when his hon. friend the Member for Flint, whom they were all glad to see in the House again, brought forward a measure with reference to theatres, he was told he ought not to speak about them, because he had not any personal experience, and, therefore, it was difficult to please everyone. The licence of an innkeeper could, of course, be opposed for not supplying refreshments; but he did not think that magistrates would be justified in refusing a licence on that ground. An innkeeper could also be proceeded against by indictment, or he could be sued for damages; but both were very cumbrous methods. The Bill before the House would provide a simple and expeditious means of carrying out the present law. It was not at present proposed to apply the Bill to Scotland or Ireland, as they did not know whether it was wanted there; but if the Scottish or Irish Members manifested a unanimous desire to have Scotland or Ireland included, he did not think the promoters of the Bill would have any objection.

He wished to impress on the House that the Bill was not intended to bully or coerce innkeepers. It only proposed to stimulate them to meet the demand which had arisen, and which he believed they were in most cases ready to meet. Even the debate last session did a great deal of good. He himself on that occasion alluded to the refreshment-room at Ipswich, which had been turned into a regular drinking-shop, where no food was to be had unless after ordering it and waiting for it. He did not know whether his speech had been reported in the local papers, but he was glad to be able to state that food was now always obtainable there. An hon. Member said in the debate last session that he had never been in the refreshment-room where he was not able to get a good sandwich. Some refreshment-rooms were very fair, but generally the refreshment-rooms in this country were very inferior to the refreshment-rooms abroad. They quite agreed that if this Bill were allowed to pass there would be less intoxicating liquor consumed, but even if that were so, the innkeeper would make it up in other ways, and he thought if this Bill were allowed a Second Reading it would do more for temperance and sobriety than the coercive measures which were sometimes advocated. He begged to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Sir Brampton Gurdon.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): In seconding the Motion said he had only a very few words to add. The Bill was so narrow and affected such small interests that he did not think there was any reason to occupy the time of the House. The Bill was in no sense a temperance measure. Its only object was that young men and women on their holidays through country lanes should be accommodated, if they so wished, to a cup of tea and a slice of bread and butter and an egg, to help them on their journey. If they preferred beer or whisky it would be at their disposal. Cyclists as was well known were in many cases comparatively poor people, who would never see the country except for the use of those wonderful machines. The Bill did not interfere with any rights and privileges of the trade, it only gave people power to assert their right in a particular class of licensed house to have what they required, and that class of house was a class which was compelled by law to give all kinds of refreshments to properly qualified persons. That being so, he appealed to those who took a strong line on the licensing question not to stand in the way of the Second Reading of this Bill, and so defeat for another long period the privileges many thousands of people desired to have.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.) said he had listened with some attention to the earnest appeal of his hon. friend the Member for Leicester, and, so far as he was concerned, would be the last man in the world to interfere with his hon. friend having his cup of tea and slice of bread and butter, and his egg, or even a rasher of bacon and a pot of marmalade. But while he sympathised with his hon. friend, he was of opinion that it was necessary that this Bill should be well considered and thought out before the House allowed it to pass a Second Reading. As he had said, he had no desire to interfere with the comfort and welfare of his hon. friend, nor did he desire to inconvenience the hon. Baronet who had moved the Second Reading, but it appeared to him that this Bill was brought in simply because on one occasion the hon. Baronet had lost his lunch at Ipswich. It was preposterous and offensive to the House that its time should be occupied for hours on a Bill of this kind for such a reason. He thought before he had finished he would show the House that this Bill was absolutely unnecessary, and not only unnecessary but in absolute contravention to the present law of the land, because under the present law every innkeeper supplied the demands of every traveller. Already there was an endeavour to fix what a *bonâ fide* traveller really was, and was the House to allow an hon. Member to come to the House with a Bill of this character and define by it what a traveller was and what he was to be supplied with? He thought it was only right to tell the House that a similar Bill was passed some years ago in South Africa, and it led to the most grievous and disastrous consequences. There was a South African millionaire of, he believed, the German Jewish persuasion, who ordered, in a perfectly innocent way, drink without the accompanying luncheon, as provided by the Bill. He was taken before the Courts and charged with contravening the provisions of the Act. When the judge was about to condemn him, the South African German Jewish millionaire turned to his Lordship and said "Sir, there was nothing but pork to eat, and I prefer to keep the law of Moses than the law of the land." With that touching spectacle of the South African millionaire before them, they were asked to agree to a similar Bill which would act very hardly on people of different religions.

The hon. Gentleman had told them that the provisions of this Act should not apply to a traveller when he was intoxicated. He quite agreed with the hon. Member in that view, but having stated that reasonable provision the hon. Gentleman went on to say "or for any other cause whatsoever." That alone demonstrated that the Bill, which had been brought in in a very unfinished state would give rise to every sort of complication. The hon. Member had referred to the Licensing Act of 1902 and had mentioned the word "innkeeper," but he did not define the difference between an innkeeper and a licensed victualler. Section 9 of the Act of 1902 set forth in a very clear form that on a conviction before the Court it should be the duty of the Clerk to the Justices to enter notice of such conviction. The hon. Member must confess that his Bill must fall short of what was necessary, because it did not explain the definition of an innkeeper, or the difference between an innkeeper and a licensed victualler, and this Bill was only applicable to one of them. He was sure that not even one of the teetotal party of the House desired to go back on the solemn compact of last year or to do anything in contravention of the Licensing Act of 1902. Then the hon. Gentleman had cited an Act as old as Methuselah, and entitled the Innkeepers Act of 1863. He (Major Jameson) was only ten years old at the time and had no recollection of that measure, and he did not anticipate that more than two or three other hon. Members would be better informed of its provisions than himself. The House would certainly take the view that the hon. Member was taking a very unfair advantage in citing that Act, because, whilst he thus imposed fresh liabilities on the innkeeper, the hon. Gentleman made no attempt to take away any of the old liabilities under that measure.

The hon. and gallant Member proceeded to quote at length from the 1863 Act, when—

*MR. SPEAKER ruled him out of order, observing that his comments on that Act were quite irrelevant to the Bill before the House, which merely adapted from the Act of 1863 an interpretation of the word "innkeeper."

MAJOR JAMESON bowed to the Speaker's ruling, but contended that it was very difficult to deal with the items of the Bill when neither the proposer nor the seconder could give any definition of the word innkeeper. He had desired to refer to another Act, passed in the year 1828, before their grandfathers had gone into business, and if he had been in order would have shown the House the bearing of that Act on the present Bill. He appealed with the utmost confidence to the House not to allow a Bill of this kind to be brought before it without any opportunity being given hon. Members to consider it, and begged to move.

MR. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.), the greater part of whose speech was inaudible in the press gallery, seconded the Amendment. He said that the term "innkeeper" had a broader meaning than was usually attached to it, in that it applied to any place of refreshment, and he contended that it was hardly fair that all such persons should be compelled to provide board and lodging to any traveller who might happen to be in the neighbourhood. Moreover, the term "refreshment" was very vague, and ought to be better defined. "Licensed person," embraced every individual who held any form of licence whatever, so persons who held off-licences or licences for the sale of wines and spirits in bottles, would be compelled to supply refreshments. The hon. Member was quoting from various Acts of Parliament in support of his rendering of the meaning of the different terms, when—

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) asked whether the hon. Member, by quoting Acts of Parliament, was not contravening the ruling already given from the Chair.

*MR. SPEAKER : I was unable to hear what the hon. Member was saying.

MR. PATRICK WHITE said he was endeavouirng to show how a licensed person was defined by Act of Parliament. The hon. Member proceeded again to quote from various Acts.

*MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member is going too far. It is a very simple matter. Clause 7 defines the term, "licensed victualler," by reference to a previous Act, and the hon. Member is entitled to comment on the definition there referred to, but further than that he cannot go.

MR. PATRICK WHITE said the Bill proposed to penalise licensed persons for not doing that which a previous Act declared to be illegal. These matters showed that the persons responsible for the drafting of this Bill had not sufficiently considered its effects. Their object was no doubt a laudable one, but the Bill violated licensing statutes of previous years, and for that reason the House should reject it. The Bill also provided that persons convicted of the slightest infringement of its provisions should be subjected to the severe penalties provided for in the Act of 1902, and he would mention the offences with which that Act was intended to deal and compare them with the trifling matters for which the same punishment would be inflicted under the Bill before the House. He thought the House would agree that the Clause he had alluded to would be a very serious punishment under what was called this harmless Bill. The hon. Member was proceeding to quote other sections from the Act, when—

*MR. SPEAKER intervened and said: This is a Second Reading Debate. I will not say that these arguments might not be legitimate on the Committee stage of the Bill, when these clauses are under consideration. The hon. Member will not be out of order in referring generally to his objection that this Bill is inflicting a severe penalty as compared with the previous Acts; but by reading these numerous sections from previous Acts with reference to a mere detail he is doing something which is quite contrary to the practice of the House. I hope the hon. Member will confine himself to the main Question.

MR. PATRICK WHITE thought this Bill would harass innkeepers and others. There were a large number of people who kept restaurants and tea or coffee rooms, and who retired from their businesses at eight or nine o'clock at night; but under this Bill any traveller would be entitled to demand board, lodgings or refreshments. He thought it was hardly reasonable to impose such an obligation on them. Under the section to which the hon. Member had referred, a man might demand board and lodgings from people who knew nothing about him, and it would enable bad characters to get inside places in order to find out their construction and to facilitate, later on perhaps, the robbing of the house or the owners. He did not think that such legislation should be passed by the House of Commons. No doubt the promoters were honest in their efforts, but the Bill before them was coercive and restrictive, and penalised a very important and responsible trade in this country. Innkeepers and hotel people were not so inhuman as to deprive any one of facilities for obtaining lodgings or refreshments, and scarcely any cases of hardship had been made out in the discussion. He submitted that before this Bill was passed, instances should be adduced and examples given where the present law was unsatisfactory. This was an attempt at legislation which was not necessary to meet the requirements of the case, and there was no volume of public opinion asking for the measure except perhaps a few gentlemen who were anxious to promote the cause of temperance by supplying tea and sandwiches where they were not now supplied. The present Bill was contrary to the spirit of every Act which had gone before it, and evidently its promoters had not studied the full effect of the measure which they had introduced; for that reason he hoped the House would show a sense of their disapproval of this Bill by voting against it. If next session they introduced a Bill on different lines, without having this coercive and restrictive tendency, no one would be more ready to support them than himself. He thought it ought to be made compulsory on innkeepers to supply necessary refreshments, whether at a public refreshment room, hotel, or an inn, or otherwise. The present Bill did not achieve this, and it was a very feeble attempt to upset the present law without putting anything in its stead that would be of any use to the public.

Amendment proposed—

> "To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months."—(*Major Jameson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. COCHRANE, Ayrshire, N.) said he should not follow the hon. Member for Meath in his meanderings through several Acts of Parliament. This Bill did not define what was meant by "traveller" and the definition of "innkeeper" appeared to be that very elementary one that an innkeeper was the keeper of an inn. The hon. Member had read part of the section giving the definition of an "inn" as meaning any hotel, inn, tavern, public-house or other place of refreshment, but he did not call attention to the qualifying words—

> "The keeper of which is now by law responsible for the goods and property of his guests,"

these words considerably limiting the scope of the definition. The hon. Member for Clare said the hon. Member for North Norfolk wished to promote this Bill because he did not succeed in getting a luncheon at Ipswich, but he hoped that the ventilation of this subject in the House would make innkeepers realise that it was highly desirable they should supply refreshments of a reasonable kind when they were asked for. What was the reason given? There had been instances given—not in this debate possibly, but in a debate which took place previously, where many instances were brought before the notice of the House—of country districts where a large body of their fellow countrymen who took pleasure in riding bicycles went to these various inns, and had been refused reasonable refreshments of a temperance character, although they had been offered a glass of beer. It seemed to him that this was a grievance, and in their own interests it would be wise for the innkeepers to supply reasonable refreshments.

If the proprietors of the village inns woke up to the necessities of the case, and provided reasonably clean and comfortable accommodation, he thought they would find their trade, instead of falling off, rapidly increase. The grievance undoubtedly was that they did not supply such refreshments as were wanted. There had been complaints that they did not supply the accommodation which the public desired. What had been the remedy in the past? The remedies had been of a very cumbrous nature; that was to say, it had been necessary to proceed by indictment, or to lay a complaint at the Brewster Sessions against the holder of the licence. Both of these forms of proceeding were very cumbrous. The Brewster Sessions were not held often, and the only remedy they could apply was of too drastic a nature. It would involve the loss of the licence if the innkeeper refused to give such reasonable accommodation as he was bound by law to give. He stated the law with the greatest diffidence in presence of his right hon. friend, but he thought no one could dispute that at Common Law a man who kept an inn was bound, if he had accommodation, to receive and provide food for a traveller, and that he might be indicted or be liable to an action if he refused to receive a traveller when he had accommodation and could make no reasonable excuse. It appeared to him that the best remedy would be to inflict a penalty on summary conviction, instead of by the more cumbrous methods he had indicated. Whether the penalty was too severe or not he did not venture to offer an opinion. He might say, generally speaking for the Department, that they did not oppose this Bill, but undoubtedly it would require, at a future stage, very considerable alterations to bring it into harmony with the views of the Government.

Mr. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross) said he was glad to hear that the Government did not intend to oppose the Second Reading of the Bill. He was sure that it was very acceptable that such a measure as this should be sent for consideration by the Grand Committee on Law. The hon. Baronet who moved the Second Reading of the Bill said he had no objection, and it had occurred to him that it might be possible to obtain something of a similar nature introduced into the Licensing Bill for Scotland which the Lord Advocate introduced last Wednesday. He did not know whether it would be better to have a clause in the Licensing Bill, or that the Bill now before the House should be made applicable to Scotland. Ipswich was not the only place where people could not get lunch without having something to drink. He knew that Americans who came to Ayrshire to see the haunts of Burns were very much surprised on visiting "Poosie Nansie's" that they could not get a biscuit to eat without getting at the same time a glass of whiskey.

Mr. GRETTON (Derbyshire, S.) said he was advised that the Bill made no real alteration in the law as it stood. The object of the Bill was to make the law easier of application. In past times there had been considerable difficulty in obtaining refreshments in remote parts of the country. This grievance had been a standing one of the Cyclists' Union for a long time. He thought he might say that of recent years the difficulty had very considerably diminished, and that there would be great difficulty now in finding cases in any part of the country where reasonable refreshments could not be obtained, or where it would be refused to any one asking for it reasonably. On behalf of the trade with which he was connected he might say that they had no reason to oppose the Bill. They agreed with the principle of it, and so far as they had been able to bring their influence to bear they had already been trying to carry out what was now proposed. The hon. Member who spoke on behalf of the Government suggested that the Bill would require some alteration in detail in order to make its provisions easier of application. He might say on behalf of the promoters of the Bill that they would be happy to accept Amendments to make the Bill more workable.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) expressed his entire agreement with the hon. Member who had just spoken in what he had said as to this Bill not really altering the substance of the law as it at present stood. With the general object in view on the part of the promoters, he thought everyone would be in entire sympathy. It was most desirable that people going about the country should be able to get such refreshments as they wanted, and not only intoxicating liquors. He was glad to know that the habit was spreading of providing such refreshments for those who desired them, and he believed personally, that the great security for what was right in this matter being done, was that publicans would find it to be to their interest to meet the wishes of persons who were travelling, and that the self-interest of those engaged in the trade would lead them to discover that the wise and proper thing was to provide such refreshments as were wanted. With regard to the scope of the Bill, he thought he ought to point out that it was a great deal more limited than many hon. Members seemed to think. It applied only to England, and the definition in the last clause had, he thought, the effect of limiting the application of the Bill merely to inns properly so-called, that was to say, to establishments where lodging as well as refreshments was provided for travellers.

MR. BROADHURST: That is the intention of the Bill.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY was afraid that all the hon. Members who had spoken on the Bill thought that that was not the intention of the Bill. Of course, what was desired was that those who were going about the country for health or recreation should find suitable refreshment at every place where it could naturally be expected, and one would be very glad indeed that they should have such refreshments at public-houses, as well as at inns properly so-called, that was to say where lodging was provided. At the same time the promoters of the Bill very properly did not propose to apply any compulsion with regard to the keepers of such houses who were not innkeepers in the legal sense of the term, because they realised that, after all, they were in the position of ordinary shopkeepers who carried on their trade as they pleased, subject to the licensing law. It was their interest to meet the wishes of their customers. With regard to innkeepers proper, he understood that it was the object of the Bill to apply a slight spice of compulsion. The whole point of the question was in the application of the Bill to what was known as an inn. It had been held that if an innkeeper did not profess to receive everyone, and did not hold himself out as a general innkeeper, he was not subject to the liabilities of the law. Then a question arose as to who were travellers. Everyone was supposed to know, but he thought very few did know, what a *bonâ fide* traveller was. The whole point of this Bill was in the clause providing penalties, and that was the real matter that would require consideration when the Bill went before the Committee. There was, of course, always the danger—no one could speak with authority on this point—that if they provided penalties, a weapon of that kind might be used vexatiously. The hon. and learned Gentleman referred to a case in which an innkeeper was adjudged guilty of an offence against the law for refusing to serve a man who was accompanied by a dog. When the case came before the court, evidence was given as to the character of the dog, and the animal did not come out of the examination altogether scatheless. He instanced that case to show that there were occasionally very unreasonable people who came in contact with innkeepers.

*MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.) said it appeared to him from what had fallen from the speakers who had preceded, that the Bill was only declaratory of the common law. As his right hon. and learned friend the Attorney General had said, it had been decided that the obligation on an innkeeper did not apply to an ordinary restaurant keeper nor to a publican, and he ventured to say that it did not apply to the keeper of a railway refreshment-room either. The main feature of the Bill, which would require to be very closely watched in Committee, was Section 4, which provided that whenever a licensed person was convicted of an offence under this Act, the provisions of the Licensing Act of 1902 in regard to the endorsement of the licence with a conviction under it should apply. That was a very drastic penalty for an innkeeper refusing to supply, say, a cup of tea or coffee. At the same time he thought that one of the greatest incentives to temperance would be that every licensed victualler should be bound to supply tea or coffee at the request of those who entered his house. Such a provision would go further to promote the cause of temperance than any penal legislation Parliament could pass; and as this Bill went in that direction, though not the whole way, he would give the Second Reading his support.

*MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) said that this Bill did not apply to Ireland, but he thought it should receive the support of every Member of the House. Everything which would encourage our young boys and girls to go into the country for fresh air and healthy recreation ought to be encouraged, and there was nothing in the Bill to which any respectable innkeeper should object. The first sub-Section said that an innkeeper must supply the reasonable demand of every traveller, and he took it that tea and coffee and food should be included. Speaking as practically a temperance man, he urged that the innkeeper should be obliged to supply him, if he wanted it, with a glass of beer, which he rather liked, or a half-of-whiskey if he so desired it. He spoke from that which had come under his own observation in this regard. There were numbers of cycling clubs in the big cities, the members of which took a run of forty or fifty miles into the country on a Sunday. If a cyclist had his tyre punctured and was unable to get on, why should that unfortunate individual be compelled to travel all night, pushing his bicycle in front of him, without the right to ask from an innkeeper reasonable accommodation? It should be the duty of the innkeeper to supply the unhappy cyclist with a succulent steak, a rasher of bacon, or eggs, tea, and marmalade, or accommodation for the night if necessary. That that should not be the case at the present moment was a crying evil; and if the Bill were passed he believed that there would be less drunkenness in the country at the present time. Of course there was no idea when it was asked that in an inn accommodation should be provided for man and beast, that that included a pack of hounds; but reasonable refreshment was what was asked for the traveller or cyclist. He agreed with his hon. friend the Member for North Meath that there were several anomalies in the Bill, but these could be remedied in Committee.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) expressed the hope that the division would now be taken, if a division were necessary. He knew nothing of the merits of the Bill, but it was sufficient for him that it had the support of hon. Gentlemen like the Member for Leicester, who had always been an exceeding good friend to Ireland, and who deserved to have as much help as they could give him. He was not going to start the session by being ruled out of order if he could help it, and therefore he would not attempt to discuss the Home Rule aspect of the question; but as long as the Irish Members were in that House Ireland should have a fair, square, and legitimate portion of the time of the House. Yet they found that an English Bill of only thirty-five lines had occupied two hours of the time of the House—which he thought was quite enough—while a Bill deeply affecting Ireland was waiting for consideration. He thought the House should either pass the Second Reading of this Bill at once or reject it, and go on to the consideration of other matters of great importance which aroused a great deal of interest on all sides of the House.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.) agreed with the hon. Member for East Clare that they ought to come very soon to a division. He supported this Bill because he had had very considerable experience of cycling in the southern counties of England, and had on many occasions suffered exceedingly from inability to get such refreshment as he required—even his favourite soda and milk. There were some proposals in the Bill which would have to be considered, but he would suggest that the proper time for that would be in Committee. For instance, an innkeeper should not be permitted to supply board and lodging which a traveller could not accept. There should be some penalty to meet that. As he had said, he would vote for the Bill; and as he was anxious that a division should be taken as soon as possible he would not say anything further.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 120; Noes, 16. (Division List No. 17.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)
Arrol, Sir William
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Barry, E. (*Cork, S.*)
Bell, Richard
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boland, John
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Caine, William Sproston

Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, Rt Hn J A (*Glasg.*)
Campbell, John (*Armagh, S.*)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (*Greenwich*)
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crossley, Sir Savile
Delany, William
Denny, Colonel
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (*Man'r*
Ffrench, Peter
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*
Gilhooly, James
Gordon, J. (*Londonderry, S.*)
Hammond, John
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David B. (*Swansea*)
Jones, Wm. (*Carnarvonshire*)
Joyce, Michael
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (*Salop*
Law, Andrew Bonar (*Glasgow*
Law, H. Alex. (*Donegal, W.*)
Lawson, John Grant
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (*Accrington*)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Kean, John
Maple, Sir John Blundell
More, Robt. Jasper (*Shropshire*)
Morrell, George Herbert
Murphy, John
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (*Bute*
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Brien, Kendal (*Tipp'rary Mid*
O'Connor, James (*Wicklow W.*)
O'Donnell, T. (*Kerry, W.*)
O'Kelly, Conor (*Mayo, N.*)
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Redmond, William (*Clare*)
Reid, James (*Greenock*)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde (*Bethnal Green*
Robertson, Edmund (*Dundee*)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Samuel, Herbert L. (*Cleveland*)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn Col. Edw. J.
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Charles Hilton (*Lincoln*)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, James Parker (*Lanarks*)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (*Northants*
Spencer, Sir E. (*W. Bromwich*)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan Donal
Taylor, Austin (*East Toxteth*)
Thomas, David Alfred (*Merthyr*
Thomson, F. W. (*York W. R.*)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (*Sheffield*
Wallace, Robert
Wason Eugene (*Clackmannan*)
Wason, John Cathcart (*Orkney*)
Williams, Osmond (*Merioneth*)
Wilson, John (*Glasgow*)
Wood, James
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Brampton Gurdon and Mr. Gretton.

NOES.

Austin, Sir John
Burke, E. Haviland
Cullinan, J.
Duffy, William J.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Greene, Hy. D. (*Shrewsbury*)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Milvain, Thomas
Mooney, John J.
Nolan, Joseph (*Louth, South*)
O'Brien, Patrick (*Kilkenny*)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (*Roscommon, N*
Purvis, Robert
Reddy, M.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Major Jameson and Mr. Patrick White.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc."—(*Sir Brampton Gurdon.*)

MAJOR JAMESON said he objected. The Bill was only a few hours under discussion, and should be considered by a Committee of the whole House; that was the usual course. Many hon. Members had voted for the Second Reading because they thought the Bill would be amended in Committee, and he was surprised that the hon. Baronet should have made such a Motion.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 118; Noes, 13. (Division List No. 18.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)
Arrol, Sir William
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Barry, E. (*Cork, S.*)
Bell, Richard
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boland, John
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, Rt Hn J A (*Glasg.*)
Campbell, John (*Armagh, S.*)
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)

Craig, Charles Curtis (*Antrim, S.*
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crossley, Sir Savile
Delany, William
Denny, Colonel
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (*Man'r*
Ffrench, Peter
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*
Gilhooly, James
Gordon, J. (*Londonderry, S.*)
Gretton, John
Hammond, John
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David B. (*Swansea*)
Jones, Wm. (*Carnarvonshire*)
Joyce, Michael
Law, H. Alex. (*Donegal, W.*)
Lawson, John Grant
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (*Accrington*)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Milvain, Thomas
Mooney, John J.
More, Robt. Jasper (*Shropshire*)
Morrell, George Herbert
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Brien, Kendal (*Tipp'rary Mid*
O'Connor, James (*Wicklow, W.*)
O'Donnell, T. (*Kerry, W.*)
O'Kelly, Conor (*Mayo, N.*)
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Plummer, Walter R.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Redmond, William (*Clare*)
Reid, James (*Greenock*)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde (*Bethnal Green*
Roe, Sir Thomas
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry, S. (*Limehouse*)
Samuel, Herbert L. (*Cleveland*)
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Charles Hilton (*Lincoln*)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, James Parker (*Lanarks.*
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (*Northants*
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Austin (*East Toxteth*)
Thomas, David Alfred (*Merthyr*
Thomson, F. W. (*York, W.R.*)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (*Sheffield*
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (*Barnsley*)
Wason, Eugene (*Clackmannan*)
Williams, Osmond (*Merioneth*)
Wilson, John (*Glasgow*)
Wood, James

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Brampton Gurdon and Mr. Broadhurst.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Burke, E. Haviland
Cullinan, J.
Duffy, William J.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
M'Kean, John
Nolan, Joseph (*Louth, South*)
O'Brien, Patrick (*Kilkenny*)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (*Roscommon, N.*
Reddy, M.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Spencer, Sir E. (*W. Bromwich*)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Major Jameson and Mr. Patrick White.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SATURDAYS (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.), in rising to move the Second Reading of this Bill, said he should not take up much of the time of the House in pointing out the absolute necessity for the Measure. In the year 1888 the subject of early closing of licensed houses was referred to a Select Committee of that House, and again in 1896 a Royal Commission inquired into the question, and both bodies recommended and reported that there was an absolute necessity, in the interest of the people, for closing licensed houses on Saturday evenings at nine o'clock instead of eleven. This was intended to apply to the towns and cities of Ireland, and particularly for the benefit and advantage of the wives and children of the ordinary working men, who were addicted to drinking on Saturday nights. In the working man's home there was little to attract him or meet his desires during his hours of leisure. But there were outside, in the streets of the towns and cities, gin palaces, saloons, and bars erected at enormous expenditure; the working man visited such places and partook of their grog and liquors, and they all knew the result that often followed. The keeper of one of these places said to him once that he did not invite people to come into his house, but when they did they were supplied with what they asked for, and if they took more than was good for them, well, more was the pity. He did not take this view at all. His argument was this. The gin palaces were kept open for the people, and so people came in to partake of drink. It was true that the people were not actually invited to come in, any more than rats and mice and other creatures were invited to enter the traps and cages prepared for them, but there was no doubt that the licensed houses were purposely kept open.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Does the baker not do the same thing—keep open his shop?

MR. SLOAN: The baker is a strict necessity—the publican is not. His house was now made interesting and pleasant with phonographs and gramophones; and some of the most beautiful young women in the land were employed as barmaids. He held that if men could be made to drink to excess by legislation they could be made sober by legislation. By shortening the hours on Saturday nights there would be fewer hours in which drink could be consumed. He was not intending to say for a moment that because a man went into a public house occasionally he was not leading a respectable life; but when a man showed the weakness and want of will power which allowed drink to overcome him, and neglected the duties of his home life, he (Mr. Sloan) thought that the reduction of the hours of keeping open on the Saturday night was highly desirable, and should be enacted. He had seen cases of intoxication in the streets of Belfast at eleven o'clock at night, the children standing by the father and the mother crying on the other side of him. In certain parts of Belfast, after eleven o'clock on Saturday nights, the hairdressers, and some of their young men not only had to work into the small hours of Sunday morning, in order to make those who had been drinking respectable, but had to open again for the same purpose for an hour or two later in the day. If there was one argument more than another he desired to lay stress upon it was that the public, independent of class or creed, demanded that these houses should be closed earlier. Mr. Sloan proceeded to read extracts from the evidence given before a Select Committee on the question in 1888. On that occasion the Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary said—

> "It is patent to everyone that on Saturday night there is more drinking than on any other night of the week, because men are generally paid their wages on Saturdays, and though intending to spend them only in making proper purchases, they very often spend their money foolishly."

The General Inspector of Belfast said—

> "I think you will find no persons in Belfast, with the exception of a very few, not even excepting the publicans themselves, who would object to an early hour of closing on Saturdays I think nine o'clock is a fairly reasonable and very moderate hour."

The Commissioner of the Dublin Metropolitan Police said—

> "I know the Roman Catholic clergy are strongly in favour of closing early on Saturday night."

Mr. Charles Joseph O'Donnell, a former Chief Inspector of Dublin, said—

> "I think it would be a very good thing to say that the public houses shall be closed now at ten o'clock, and then to give fair warning that at the end of a certain period they will be closed at an earlier hour."

Mr. W. Davis, a former District Inspector of Belfast, said—

> "If the public houses were closed at nine o'clock on Saturday nights a great portion of the drinking would be done away with. As the hour gets late the number of arrests becomes larger."

Showing that there were a larger number of arrests by the police on Saturday night, through late drinking, than on any other night of the week.

MR. REDDY (King's County, Birr): What does the Inspector say about the Custom House steps? [Cries of "Order."]

MR. SLOAN, in continuing to review the evidence given by the Committee, mentioned the declaration of Mr. Fitzgerald Dixon, the District Inspector of Sligo, that the great bulk of the arrests and convictions in Sligo were on Saturday nights, and he suggested the closing of the public-houses at nine o'clock on that day. The Mayor of Cork said:—

> "If you would give me a chance to-morrow to say whether I would have Saturday or Sunday closing, I would say Saturday night closing, as a greater evil than the whole of the opening on Sunday."

There was no question that, alike in Belfast and the rest of Ireland, public feeling was growing in the direction of earlier closing on Saturday nights. He had had the privilege of mixing with many working-men who took a glass of beer, and they assured him that they were anxious that they should at least be able to go through the streets of our cities and towns at ten or eleven on Saturday nights, without being subjected to such visions of drunkenness and rascality as were very often to be seen. He suggested that hon. Members should endeavour to consider this matter impartially, and that when they spoke they should try as far as possible to speak in the interests of those whom they ought to represent. He knew the Bill was a blow at the Trade. It must, however, be remembered that there were any number of individuals in our workhouses to-day through the scourge of drink, and any number of individuals in our asylums and prisons for the same reason. If, therefore, the Bill was going to injure the Trade it must be remembered that the Trade had long enough injured the community.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): It was not the drink that brought me to prison, any way.

MR. SLOAN, continuing, said he had considered as far as possible all the recommendations of the Select Committee which sat in 1888, and the recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1896, and they should endeavour at least to give some consideration to those recommendations in the interests of the sobriety of the country, and of those who were undoubtedly subjected to great annoyance by the late hours the public-houses remained open on Saturday nights. Not only did the public-houses keep open till eleven o'clock, but they kept the individuals employed in them till twelve or one o'clock in consequence, those individuals being engaged in making the necessary preparations for the Sunday opening. From a Trades Union point of view, therefore, as well as from the better housing point of view — for the money spent in drink would go a long way to alleviate the trouble caused by the existing housing difficulty—there ought to be a shortening of public-house hours. He had no feeling of antipathy against any man connected with the Trade. He was a temperance man by conviction, and it was admitted, even by those engaged in the Trade, that temperance was best. Under those circumstances, he thought the Committee could not do better than accept the recommendations of the Select Committee of 1888 and the Royal Commission of 1896, and he asked the House to give the Bill a Second Reading.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.) failed to understand what weighty objections there could be to the Bill. So far back as 1888 a Select Committee of that House approved the terms contained in this Bill, and reported that in their opinion a great deal of excessive drunkenness, which had been proved to have taken place on Saturday night, would be avoided by the earlier closing of public-houses on that day. They further reported that they were satisfied that such a measure would be supported by public opinion generally throughout Ireland. The Committee recommended among other things that all houses for the sale of intoxicating liquors should be closed at 9 p.m. on Saturdays. Then, in 1896, the Royal Commission on Licensing, under the presidency of Lord Peel, unanimously reported in favour of having public-houses closed at nine o'clock on Saturdays. In 1897 a memorial was presented to the then Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland asking him to use his influence with the Government of the day to have this Bill passed into law. That memorial was signed by sixteen Roman Catholic Bishops, thirteen Protestant Bishops, the Moderator of the Presbyterian Synod, the Vice-President of the Methodist Conference, fifteen of the nobility, twenty-one Members of Parliament, 1,036 clergymen, 1,018 magistrates, 291 doctors, 207 poor law guardians and town commissioners, and 1,117 merchants and employers. It was also signed at twenty-seven large public meetings of temperance bodies, and by many thousands of people in Ireland. He ventured to say that since that memorial was presented public opinion had become greatly in favour of this Bill. It had the approval and support of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and clergymen of Ireland, and, so far as he was aware, the only party in Ireland who protested against it was the Association of Licensed Grocers and Vintners.

As compared with the present law, the Bill only gave two hours earlier for closing than usual, for one night in the week, in the cities and large towns, and one hour earlier in towns with a population of less than 5,000, and in rural districts. Was that too much of a concession to ask the Trade to make on behalf of the public good? He held that an incalculable amount of good would be accomplished by the closing of licensed premises at that time, chiefly because of the surrounding circumstances. It was during the last hours that the temptations were the strongest. After the labours of the week the working man had his earnings in his pocket, and at the close of his evening meal he would take a walk. Perhaps he would meet a fellow worker and ask him to have a drink, and with the system of treating, as every one knew, the result was that both men would stay in the public-house until a late hour, probably until closing time. They would then go home muddled and intoxicated, not thinking or caring about the morrow, and quite regardless of the duty they owed to their religion and their country. In that way they spent money which was wanted for food and clothing by their wives and families. It was with the object of lessening the temptations that beset these poor people that this Bill was introduced. The Bishop of Limerick was asked to attend a meeting held under the auspices of the Irish Association for the Prevention of Intemperance in Dublin, last February, and in a letter of regret at not being able to attend, his Lordship said he was convinced of the immense amount of good the Bill would effect at a minimum of loss and inconvenience, and it would be regarded as a very great blessing by an overwhelming majority of the population. Throughout last year and the early part of the present year meetings were held under the auspices of that Association, and resolutions were passed thereat in favour of the Bill.

It might be argued by members of the Trade that if public-houses were closed earlier on Saturday nights, men would resort to clubs and shebeens for drink. With that view he did not agree, and he did not think it could be said of the great majority of Irish people. As a rule they did not drink for the love of drink, although, of course, there were drinkers of the type who in England would be on the black list. Let them judge the Bill on its merits, and on its merits alone. If men went into shebeens they violated the law, and it was the duty of the authorities to cope with the evil. If they resorted to clubs and drank to excess, the sooner steps were taken to regulate clubs, as was done in England, the better it would be for the country. Another reason why the Bill should become law was, that it would give a much needed rest to the bar tenders, who were on their feet from early morning until late at night, and worked harder than those employed in any other business. A further argument used against the Bill was that, as grocery and spirit businesses were so mixed up in Ireland, it would be unfair to close the public-houses at nine o'clock. In answer to that argument he held that it ought not to be impossible to separate one business from the other. Public good should be placed before private interests. In all reforms it happened that a certain class was inconvenienced, but in this case, owing to the widespread development of the Saturday half-holiday, housewives had not to wait until night to do their shopping. These were the reasons why he supported the Bill. He did so from purely patriotic motives. He saw his country drained of its wealth yearly. Between thirteen and fourteen millions were spent on drink in Ireland every year. He had seen young men of ability of respectable parents go down in the battle of life owing to the cursed vice of drunkenness, and, knowing those facts, he would do all he could to further the cause of a Temperance Bill. He believed that a sober Ireland meant an industrial Ireland, in which men of brains and strong and brawny arms, would devote their intellect and strength in promoting the prosperity of their country, and striving for its regeneration. He supported the Bill because it would do something in that direction by removing the temptation, to which working men were at present exposed, to stay in the public-house drinking and carousing until a late hour on Saturday nights, when their proper place was in their homes.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green), in moving "That the Bill be read a second time this day six months," said he was satisfied that his hon. friends had not grasped the difficulties surrounding this subject, as they had not the experience of Members who lived in the cities, and who knew what the result of passing such a Bill would be. The report of the Inquiry of 1888, to which allusion had been made, was framed, not by Irish Members, but very largely by Members representing England. Why, therefore, if there was cause for complaining of over-drinking on the part of the working classes, did they not first endeavour to make the Bill applicable to their own country? He defied anybody to propose such a measure for England; the English people would not stand it for twenty-four hours; and he strongly objected to Ireland being made the ground for such an experiment. It was an insult to Ireland, as it declared us to be a drunken people. The Bill was not backed by public opinion, and, if passed, would simply result in greater injury, immorality, and drunkenness. If its promoters had taken advantage of their opportunity to introduce proposals for extending to Ireland the Acts for dealing with habitual drunkards and clubs, they would have met with much sympathy and support, but instead of that they had chosen to bring in a Bill which was strongly opposed in the country. What they had to complain of in Ireland were the bogus clubs and shebeens, and if the hon. Member had first dealt with those, he might then have some claim to propose this further measure. Living in a city he knew what happened after eleven o'clock at night when the respectable houses closed. It was then that the bogus clubs reaped their harvest. Men stayed in them all night, then went home for an hour or two, and returned to stay the remainder of the day. That was why on the Monday morning employers of labour, overseers and managers, had such difficulty in getting their men to work. He was as anxious as anyone to see a sober Ireland; he knew the terrible effects of drunkenness; but, with his knowledge of what the result of its provisions would be, he could not support such a measure as that before the House. It was true, as had been stated, that the drink-seller did not compel people to enter his establishment. But it was far better to have a respectable public-house, to which a man might go if he wished, or take a friend whom he had met, where he could obtain good drink, without the risk of being poisoned by the stuff served at some of the places to which he might otherwise be driven. The Bill was supposed to be one dealing with the liquor traffic, but in the country places in Ireland the grocer at whose establishment the liquor was sold, was frequently the butcher, baker, tea seller, and draper; therefore, if he had to close early on Saturday night all these other commodities would be affected. Even though a sacrifice were made for the public good, as the hon. Member for Limerick suggested, by the making of structural alterations to divide the one part of the business from the other, it should be remembered there was a re-valuation question in Ireland, and every structural alteration would have to be re-valued and much hardship thereby inflicted. He claimed to be fortified in his attitude on this matter by the working men of Dublin. When President of the Trades Council of that city he was sent to give evidence before the Parliamentary Committee, with a mandate to protest against Sunday and early Saturday night closing. It would not be correct to say there was not a section of the community in favour of the Bill. There was, for instance, the class of people who attended the Rotunda meeting to which reference had been made, but they were the people who would not allow a man to have a glass of beer at all, and such, he thought, were not the people to deal with a question of this kind. The only meeting of a public nature that had been held in connection with the matter was one of working men of Dublin in Phœnix Park, at which resolutions strongly condemning the proposal were passed.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) asked when that meeting was held.

*MR. NANNETTI said it was held some ten years ago, but until another was held and the decision reversed the resolutions stood.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL said another meeting was held on the very same day.

*MR. NANNETTI, continuing, said that not only did the hon. Member for West Limerick not represent the majority of the Irish Members on this question, but he doubted whether he represented his own constituency. He, on the other hand, was supported by the Chief Magistrate of the City of Dublin, and the other members for the City and county, two of whom were teetotalers. It was an insult to the people of Ireland to suggest that such legislation was required to make them sober; it was coercion, pure and simple. He denied that public opinion in Ireland was in favour of the Bill. There had been twenty-seven meetings of magistrates held in the cause of temperance, and, with the exception of two, there was no allusion to Saturday closing. The two exceptions were Derry and Galway, and it should be remembered that in Galway the houses already had to close early. If the Bill were passed, people who had money in their pockets and desired drink would be compelled to take bottles home, where the wives and children would probably then have a share, while others would go to the clubs and shebeens. The late Mr. Parnell had spoken very strongly against the principle of the measure, and his opinion ought surely to have some weight with the Members of the Irish Nationalist Party. Mr. Parnell, in his speech at the time a similar Bill was before the House, said on the question of the experiment being made in Ireland of licensing legislation that—

> "The Bill will come to Ireland as a patronising attempt on the part of the majority of the English Members in the House of Commons to make the Irish people sober. The Irish people will naturally say, 'Make yourselves sober first.' Why should this experiment be made upon the body of the Irish people? Perhaps on the principle of *fiat experimentum in corpore vili.* Anything is good enough for Ireland, no matter how doubtful its character. No doubt that is the view of the great majority of the Liberal Party in the House, but a measure conceived under such auspices is foredoomed to failure. The Irish people will naturally say 'This is a part of the insolent system to which we have been accustomed for so many years on the part of the English nation; and we decline to believe in our excessive drunkenness in comparison with our kind English friends.' The Irish people will doubt the *bonâ-fides* of this measure, and will do their best to circumvent it, as the measures in existence have already been circumvented."

In pointing out that no exceptional circumstances had arisen for such drastic legislation, the same speaker said, and I commend his words to those members of my Party who are supporting this Bill. He said—

> "No one would dare to propose such a measure as this for any English city, and surely English Liberals and Radicals, who have pledged themselves to the principle of Home Rule, and who denounce all English legislation for Ireland on the ground that it comes in a foreign garb, might have waited for some cases to be set up of exceptional intemperance before they support this Coercion Bill, for it is one.
>
> Is any case made out for doing for these Irish cities and towns what would not be done in the case of any large English city? No attempt has ever been made to show in the case of these Irish towns that there is any exceptional drunkenness or crime arising out of intemperance."

Since Mr. Parnell's speech statistics had shown that crime and drunkenness had been on the decrease in Ireland, and the measures at the disposal of the Executive were quite sufficient to deal with this question. The licensed dealers, if they had any regard for their business, would only be too delighted to see drunkenness stamped out. The drunkard was of no use to any house, for he generally had no money, and the licensed trader would be delighted to keep the like of him out of the house. He could not allow the extracts read by the hon. Member for South Belfast to go unchallenged. He would quote to the House opinions showing that the men of Ireland were as anxious as anyone else to keep down drunkenness, but they were also anxious to keep free from the consequences and risks which might follow in the wake of this Bill if it became law. The Most Rev. Dr. Walsh, the Archbishop of Dublin, gave his opinion upon bogus clubs. The hon. Member for South Belfast said there was no such thing as bogus clubs in Belfast, but he ventured to prophesy that if this Bill were passed they would spring up like mushrooms. He could not believe that Englishmen would attempt to pass such legislation as this, in direct opposition to the views and feelings of the people of Ireland. The Archbishop of Dublin, speaking of bogus clubs, said—

> "Within the last few months the evils of the 'Bogus Club' system in Dublin have been largely increased. Those evils are already growing at a rate sufficiently rapid to make every true friend of temperance in our city view with alarm the possibility of anything being done that could tend to the further development of so ruinous a system. The so-called Sunday Closing Bill, if passed into law, could not fail to lead to a disastrous development of it. I am, therefore, strenuously opposed to the enactment of such a measure. I am, in fact, opposed to the imposition of further restrictions of any kind upon the licensed trade in Dublin, so long as the present system of absolutely unlicensed trading in the 'Bogus Clubs' is allowed by law to continue."

This, then, was the view at that time of one of the most eminent divines in Ireland, and I have no reason to think that he has changed them since. The Mayor of Waterford (Mr. Toole) said in his evidence before the same Commission that—

> "Shebeen drinking and drinking in low public-houses after hours would be increased by the closing of public-houses totally on Sundays."

His hon. friend the Member for South-East Cork, speaking as the President of the Cork Trades Council, said—

> "Being personally interested in total abstinence, I have made it my business to look round the City and go into the lowest dens and the highest hotels, and I think that there is very little shebeening in Cork. There is a little, but probably there would be a great deal more if the houses were closed on Sundays. The great majority are in favour of leaving things as they are."

He also gave evidence himself, and speaking as the mouthpiece of the Dublin Trades Council and the Irish Labour Correspondent to the Board of Trade, he said—

> "If you close the public-houses men who want to get drink will go into what are called beerhouses and other houses of doubtful fame, where beer is sold on the quiet, and this would be productive of immorality. If you introduce home drinking it would be a temptation to the wives and children of our families to join in it, and from being sober wives, as we wish them to be, they would possibly become drunkards."

The men who were attempting to pass this Bill into law could take their friends into legitimate clubs, but working men had few such clubs, and he would rather see them not go into these clubs at all. But even the legitimate clubs ought to be under the supervision of the Act. What made him take a strong stand upon this was that the class of club he spoke of was springing up in the City, which it was taking all the time of the police to try to put a stop to. In his evidence the Mayor of Limerick said—

> "I believe that the people who want drink will get it, and there will be a supply created to meet the demand. I am thoroughly opposed to Sunday closing, and with regard to early Saturday night closing I do not give any opinion at present, but I express this opinion of the city through its proper channel, the Corporation and the Trades, as being totally opposed to any change with regard to Saturday closing, and in that opinion I concur."

The Congregated Trades of Limerick passed a Resolution in the following terms—

> "We are strongly of opinion that if such a Bill becomes law, its results would be to encourage the illicit trade and lead to the system of introducing drink into the houses of the people, and spread very extensively the contaminating vice of intemperance."

The Chief Police Magistrate of Dublin says—

> "I think the number of shebeen houses would increase very considerably if you shut up the public houses altogether, or shut them up too early on Saturday night."

The Rev. Dr. Tynan, the parish priest of St. Michael's and St. John's, Dublin, says—

> "The result of closing the public-houses at ten o'clock or at nine o'clock on the Saturday night would be to throw open the shebeens to the people who would otherwise drink in the public-house."

Mr. Ward, one of the superintendents of the Dublin Police Force, said—

> "That a curtailment of the hours on Saturday night, or the extension of the present Act to Dublin, would lead to the increasing of shebeening."

Mr. Charles Dawson's opinion was—

> "To my mind the Act would lead to improper drinking at home and in places far away from powers of observation."

Sir David Harrel, the Under Secretary for Ireland, and formerly Chief Commissioner of the Dublin Police, was asked if the closing of public-houses would lead to the establishment of drinking clubs, and he replied—

> "I think it would tend to. I should think that would be a very possible consequence, and I think the consequence would be disastrous. To close public-houses on Saturday nights at nine o'clock would result in a very great inconvenience to the Dublin public within the city boundary."

And lastly, the Dublin United Trades' Council and Labour League resolved—

> "That we protest against the closing of the public-houses in Ireland on Sundays and early closing on Saturdays, and we believe it to be an uncalled for and coercive measure, and we call upon our representatives in Parliament to oppose the Bill."

He thought he had now said sufficient to show that the hon. Member for Belfast had not all the opinions on his side in favour of Saturday closing. His experience was that the greatest evils arose from illicit drinking, which took place after the public-houses were closed, in bogus clubs and other places. He would advise those who were so anxious for temperance legislation to visit some of the clubs and see for themselves what was being done there. Before they attempted to pass this Bill they should first have attempted to give Ireland the benefit of the Bill which they had passed for England a trial in Ireland, and if it failed, then there might be some reason to ask for Saturday closing. If they did that they might expect a more favourable reception from hon. Members on his side of the House, who were as anxious to see Ireland sober as hon. Gentlemen opposite. He was as much opposed to the long hours worked in public-houses as hon. Members opposite, and would be prepared to support any Bill brought in to limit them, but at the same time he objected to the legislation which was now proposed, as he honestly believed it would only increase the evil which its promoters hoped to cure. He therefore hoped the House would adopt the Amendment standing in his name. He moved it.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.) seconded the Amendment. The speech of the hon. Member who had just sat down was one of the strongest he had ever listened to. On the one side they had heard matters of fact, and on the other side they had been asked to pity the drunken father in Belfast with ten children clinging to him singing, "Father, dear father, come home." He had always been lead to think that the people of Belfast were sober people. He wished to remind the House that most of those licensed houses were also grocers and bakers, and, therefore, by this Bill they would stop a man buying the necessaries of life after a certain hour. This measure would mean practically that they would be asking these people to rebuild their premises, so as to make one side a licensed shop and the other a grocer's shop. It was a fallacy to assume that the people of Ireland would ever consent to such a thing. Ireland consumed less wines and spirits than England or Scotland, but this Bill would stamp Ireland as being a drunken country, where the working classes were unable to take care of themselves. Could any measure be more absurd? He felt sure that the passing of this Bill would drive the working classes into the haunts of vice and crime. Allowing men to drink in these licensed places was far more likely to lead to temperance than attempting to prevent them getting what they desired, and thus driving them into those wretched shebeens. It was a well-known fact that Saturday was the pay-day in most of the manufacturing towns in Ireland. Many working men received their money late on Saturday, and according to the proposal now before the House they were no longer to be allowed to do their shopping and to purchase the necessaries of life after nine o'clock. If the House passed this Bill on what shoulders would this enormous deprivation and punishment be placed? Not on the shoulders of hon. Gentlemen who put their names on the back of the Bill. They had their own cellars. If they were of the temperance persuasion they were simply condemning what they regarded as the sins of others. They would not allow a commodity which others regarded as a necessity because they disliked it themselves.

The promoters of this kind of legislation did not go to the great root of the evil by providing inducements for the working man to remain in his own home. He thought the House would agree with him that the first thing the hon. Member for South Belfast ought to have done, when he had the opportunity on a Friday afternoon, was to bring in a Bill for the housing of the working classes instead of bringing in a Bill which would interfere with working men's freedom. He had yet to learn that the House of Commons, which refused Home Rule to Ireland and would not allow the Irish people to legislate for themselves, was going to do such a grossly unfair act as to pass this Bill, which was directed against the soberest portion of the three kingdoms. He asked the House in the name of common-sense to refuse to penalise the traders of Ireland by enacting that their shops should be closed at nine o'clock, because it suited a few faddists to say that they should be so closed. He hoped the House would, by an overwhelming majority, reject the Bill, because he believed it was a measure which would undoubtedly send working men into the haunts of vice and crime. In Dublin 30,000 visits had been paid by the police in one year to licensed premises, but the convictions for breaches of the law only amounted to ten. In the face of that fact were they going to say that Dublin was a drunken city, and that public-houses should be closed at nine o'clock? He asked the House in the name of freedom not to place on the backs of the Trade in Ireland a burden which they would not dare to put on the Trade in England and Scotland.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Nannetti.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. T. W. RUSSELL said, so far as Irish Members were concerned, he believed he and another hon. Member were the sole Parliamentary survivors of the Committee of 1888, which had been referred to so frequently in the course of the debate. He had listened with something akin to astonishment at the use made on the other side of the House of the evidence given before the Council. What had taken place? In 1888 he carried a Bill precisely similar to this through the stage of Second Reading, and with the aid of Lord Randolph Churchill, who was a warm friend of the Measure, he secured a majority of considerably over a hundred for that Bill. The Committee on Sunday closing was sitting upstairs at the time, and a Motion was carried in the House referring the Saturday Early Closing Bill to that Committee, which was then engaged in considering whether the Sunday Closing Act should be extended to the five exempted cities in Ireland. What had taken place in the House that day? Evidence had been quoted as against Saturday early closing, which before the Committee was given against total Sunday closing, for the evidence before that Committee was almost unanimously in favour of Saturday early closing and against Sunday closing. It was the most ingenuous use of evidence he had ever heard in the House of Commons. Let them take the case of Mr. C. J. O'Donnell, a police magistrate in Dublin—he was a fanatic on the Saturday closing question, but he was vehemently opposed to total Sunday closing. Yet Mr. O'Donnell's evidence against Sunday closing had been quoted as against Saturday and Sunday closing. He thought it right to tell the House frankly what use had been made of that evidence that day.

They were told that it would be time enough to pass legislation of this kind when they got an Irish Parliament. Well, that was a favourite argument in the olden days, but he did not know how far the establishment of an Irish Parliament was off. If he were satisfied that an Irish Parliament were imminent, so convinced was he of the practical unanimity of Irish opinion on this question, that he would cheerfully reserve the question until it could be settled at College Green. But why should this plea to wait for Home Rule be confined to this one measure? They had heard that day some tremendous Home Rulers among the opponents of the Bill. Some of them were not so punctual in their attendance when Irish questions were under discussion. They were to-day, he maintained, the sole opponents of a purely Irish Bill. They were told that the promoters ought to have done something else. They were told that they ought to have brought in a Bill to regulate clubs. If they had done so, would the hon. Members opposite have supported it? He had been nearly twenty years in the House, and went through all the Sunday closing battle. What was the argument then? Why, deal with Saturday closing first! That was where all the mischief arose. They said get rid of the Saturday night mischief first, and don't trouble about Sunday. Now that they had come to deal with Saturday closing, they found that hon. Gentlemen opposite wanted the clubs regulated. Very well, they would meet their demands. On April the 3rd he was to be in charge of a Bill to regulate clubs, and he should be deeply interested in looking into the position of his friends who had been so vehement against the Bill now before the House. He was not going to quote Bishops and others about Saturday early closing. What he said was that there was not a Member for Ireland who did not know that the whole balance of public opinion, clerical and lay, was in favour of this Bill.

There was not a man there who did not know where the opposition to this Bill sprang from. If anyone doubted it, he could not have been in the Outer Lobby during the last few days. Where had they got their Whips from? From the licensed victuallers of Dublin, Belfast, Cork, Limerick, and other places. Crowds of them had been in the Lobby putting pressure upon Members. He was not going to say that if the public-houses were closed two hours earlier on Saturdays, there would be no resort to the shebeens. He believed that every curtailment of the drink traffic had its dangers in that way. But what did the hon. Gentlemen opposite take the people of Ireland for? Did they imagine that Ireland was a nation of drunkards? [OPPOSITION cries of "No, no!"] He admitted that the confirmed drunkard if prevented from getting drink legally on Saturday nights would smell round and get it. But were there nobody but drunkards to be considered? Was it not worth while to make it easy for people to do right and difficult to do wrong? It was in the interests of all, and not in the interests of drunkards, that the Bill was required, and it was their desire that young men and young women would not go to clubs and shebeens. He agreed with the testimony of almost every Catholic bishop and Protestant minister in saying that the working men's homes would be pounds richer every year, and their children given a better chance of obtaining what tens of thousands of them were at present deprived of, if the keeping open of public houses to a late hour were prevented. He distinctly declared to the House of Commons that the only opposition to this Bill came from the publicans of Ireland. [Cries of "No, no!"] He asked whether his hon. friend for North Kerry would show him any circulars he got from any other source than the Trade.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I wish to say that no publican or anyone else has put pressure on me.

MR. RUSSELL said that every circular that came to him, and he had received about a dozen, had been from the Trade, and all the efforts to get support for the Bill had come from those who were endeavouring to save the country from the red ruin caused by drink.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said the matter before the House had already been thoroughly discussed on this and other occasions, and therefore he thought a division might be taken. He believed he could speak with some little authority on this matter, because it was one on which he had not always held exactly the same opinion. The hon. Member for South Tyrone had stated that he had been nearly twenty years in the House. He himself had been somewhat longer in the House; and during all that time this Question had been in one way or another brought up and discussed. There were always Members who argued that the early closing of public-houses on Saturday and closing on Sunday were not the proper methods of proceeding with temperance reform. He confessed that when he was a young man he was influenced by these arguments, but he had waited for twenty years for those

Gentlemen to bring forward proposals which would be more efficacious and generally acceptable than those which had been made from time to time, but he had never heard any such proposals. He was profoundly convinced of the absolute necessity for something being done, not to prevent the Irish people from being more drunken than the people of this or any other country, for they were nothing of the kind, but to make it easier for men to preserve their sobriety and their money for the benefit of their families and the welfare of the country generally.

He was not one of those who imagined that the proper way to proceed in this matter was to cast reflections upon the gentlemen connected with the licensed trade in Ireland. He knew many of them, and they were upright and honourable traders in their line of business. They were endeavouring to safeguard their interests, as was only natural, and he had no attack to make upon them. On the contrary, he believed a great number of them would not object to this measure if they thought it would do something to promote the general cause of temperance. When he was recently in the United States he was profoundly impressed with the position of the people of the Irish race, who had carefully guarded themselves in this matter of temperance. They were prosperous, wealthy, and generally respected. In America he had a hard time answering attacks on the cause he represented, but he was fairly well able to hold his own. When, however, he was from time to time confronted with the statement that in Ireland between seventy and eighty million dollars were spent every year in drink, he found that he was unable to give anything which could possibly be considered by the friends of Ireland, an adequate explanation of that fact. Although per head of the population the Irish were more temperate than the Scotch and English he believed they spent more in drink than they could afford, for their taxable capacity was not as great. He believed that the hon. Member for South Tyrone—whose bitter enemy he had been for many years in this House—was correct in stating that the vast majority of the Irish people were at one on this measure. The opposition to the Bill came from the Trade, and not from the people. The people had not held meetings to oppose the Bill.

MR. NANNETTI said a meeting was held in the Phœnix Park on this very question.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: With reference to this Bill?

MR. NANNETTI: A Bill of a similar character.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said there might be an exception, but he defied contradiction when he stated that, generally speaking, there had been nothing in the shape of a widespread expression of opinion against the Bill. The only meetings, which he knew, that had been held outside the people interested in these matters, the only free and open meetings of citizens—representing all classes and creeds—had been in favour of the Bill—meetings in Dublin, Belfast, and Cork. [Cries of dissent from IRISH MEMBERS.] Well, at any rate, that was his statement, and he was open to correction if he were wrong. The masses of the working people and the citizens of Ireland at large, as shown by their popular demonstrations, had, generally speaking, expressed their opinion in favour of this measure and not against it. He was sorry to separate himself from hon. Gentlemen with whom he had been working with absolute unanimity of spirit for so long, but he did propound his belief that, whether Catholics or Protestants, almost all were in favour of the Bill. It was not possible for any one, Catholic or Protestant, to go through the length and breadth of Ireland without seeing there was something necessary, not to make the people less drunken—for they were already less drunken than any other portion of the world—but to further the cause of sobriety. He had been very much surprised that some Member of the Irish Government had not been present during this debate. He thought that was simply scandalous. It was not treating those either in favour of, or opposed to, the Bill with proper courtesy. It was urged that this was a Bill which should be left to the Irish Parliament to deal with. That was the view of the late Mr. Parnell, but even supposing the Irish Parliament was, in the least degree, likely to deal with this matter on the most moderate terms, he thought that this was a Bill which ought to be passed now. It was said that the result would be to create an increase of shebeening, which everybody must condemn; but if that were the case, a measure of this kind could easily be repealed. He appealed to what was undoubtedly the expressed opinion of the Irish people, and in their interest, and that of their children, he asked the House to agree to the Second Reading of the Bill.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir E. CARSON, Dublin University) said he would not make a speech of any considerable length on this subject. He need hardly say that he did not rise on behalf of the Irish Government, but simply as an Irish Member, representing an Irish constituency, to a large extent composed of clergy of the Irish Church, to which he belonged. So far as his constituents were concerned he was well aware that they were absolutely in agreement with the hon. Member, who had just sat down, when he said that this very modest measure ought to be passed as soon as possible. And with that opinion he himself entirely agreed. He thought it was almost a scandal that this simple proposal to shorten the closing hours of public-houses on Saturday evenings, which had been recommended by a Committee of this House so far back as 1888, had never been put on the Statute Book. Really one would think from the opposition offered in some quarters that they were going to revolutionise the whole liquor business in Ireland, and do it a great injury. This was a small reform; he wished it had gone much further; but such as it was, it was a step in the right direction, and in his own belief was wanted. His conviction was that temperance reform in this country and in Ireland had often been thwarted because reformers tried to do too much at a time.

MR. HAVILAND BURKE (King's County, Tullamore) said he had a feeling of great regret at being separated on this question from some of his colleagues, for whom he had personal esteem and affection. But there were certain cases in which it was cowardly to give a silent vote, and the present occasion was one of these. He invited the attention of the House to the fact that not one of the supporters of the Bill had given any definite proof that the public opinion of Ireland was at their back. In his own constituency he had, since his election, received scores of communications from County Councils, District Councils, Urban Councils, Associations, and individuals on every imaginable subject; he had had resolutions forwarded to him about university education, financial relations, and many other things; but not one single resolution by a representative body asking him to support the Bill now under discussion. That was evidence that there was no overwhelming and burning desire in favour of this Measure, as had been claimed for it by some hon. Members. On a question of this kind, when they had an organisation with money and brains at its back, it was easy to get up favourable meetings in Cork, Belfast, or Dublin, but he would have preferred if the mover, seconder, and supporters of the Second Reading of the Bill had been in a position to read out resolutions in its favour from County Councils and other popular bodies elected by ballot. Something had been said about shebeening. He had often heard the argument used that if shebeens continued to exist it was because those responsible failed to administer the law; but he contended that if the shebeening, which he believed would be the immediate effect of the passing of this Bill, were to be put down, they would have to arm the constabulary of Ireland with such powers, to enter into any house in any town or village in the country, day or night, as would be found to be absolutely intolerable. It was a serious danger identified with all legislation of this character, that they could not enforce it without a system of police despotism which was intolerable to any modern community. He heartily agreed with his hon. friend the Member for East Clare that the population of Ireland drank less per head than either their Scotch or English neighbours, but it was also perfectly true that they spent a great deal more than they could afford in drink.

His objection to this special legislation for Ireland was that it tended to produce in the public mind of the civilised world the impression that Ireland required special treatment for the evils of drink. He denied that entirely; and he had to say that in the minds of men like himself, a great reaction had taken place in regard to this kind of legislation by the grossly exaggerated speeches and resolutions passed at temperance meetings. Any one able to read the English and Irish newspapers would imagine that Ireland was the most conspicuous of the three kingdoms for drunkenness. He believed that no grievance existed which entitled the House to put the principal shopkeepers in Ireland to the expense of rebuilding or remodelling their premises in order to come into line with the rules under the Bill. He believed that this measure would lead to an increase in home drinking and shebeen drinking, for men would take home with them supplies of drink. Now, he insisted that if a man must get drunk, it would be better in every way for him to get drunk in a public-house and then be chucked out to make his way home, than to find himself in a shebeen, where he would drink all through the night, take a short sleep, and then get drunk again until the Sunday night came. That was what happened in Dublin. He knew the manager of perhaps the biggest printing establishment in Ireland, who confirmed all that had been said by the hon. Member for College Division in regard to Monday being the worst day of the week for the men to work. This manager, himself a total abstainer, was of opinion that shebeening in Dublin was the cause of it. He could assure his friends, from whom he differed on this question, that he was as earnestly desirous as they were themselves, to pass any well-considered legislation which would promote the cause of temperance, but he thought that the present law had not been properly enforced, and that it had failed for want of sufficiently stern and systematic administration. He trusted that whatever law was passed, it should be the same for Irishmen, Englishmen, and Scotchmen. On these grounds he opposed the Second Reading of the Bill.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) said he could not stand up in that House to declare that he had enjoyed the pleasure of being an abstainer every other day. He had been a teetotaller for close on thirty years, but at the same time he was a believer in every man having his drink if he wanted it. There were some teetotallers who laid down the principle that every other human being should conform to their practice. That was a doctrine which had never succeeded, and would never succeed in keeping men away from the public-house. The hon. Member for South Tyrone had said that the Chief of Police in Dublin, Mr. O'Donnell, was altogether against Sunday closing, but in favour of closing at nine o'clock on Saturday night. He argued that it was immaterial whether they shut up the public-houses at nine o'clock, for if a man wanted drink he would get it at six o'clock as well as at nine o'clock. It was quite true that in five cities in Ireland the Sunday Closing Act was not in operation; but there were no statistics of the number of arrests made after the public-houses were closed on Saturday night. The only record of arrests was between eight o'clock on Sunday morning, and two o'clock in the afternoon, but he maintained that the great majority of these arrests were of men who had been drunk on the Saturday night. Where the average man was prevented from having his drink legitimately, he would get it in the sheebeen. Ireland was, as a matter of fact, one of the most drunken countries on the face of the earth, and that that was so could be seen from the arguments in favour of this Bill. He knew that the people of Ireland spent too much money in drink, and if he thought that the closing of the public-houses at nine o'clock on Saturday nights would be the means of reducing the number of drunkards he would vote in favour of it.

He had voted for prohibition in the State of Dakota, in America, where there was a prohibition law, but where there was more drunkenness than in any other State in America. In his humble judgment prohibition was a mistake from a purely temperance point of view, and they could not make the Irish people more sober than they were by legislation. There was no better evidence that the best way to promote sobriety was personal influence than in the crusade of Father Matthew, who did more in a short space of time for the cause of temperance than all the legislation ever passed. The true methods were not coercive methods, but to go among the people and advise them individually what was good for them. He could speak from experience in his own county of Kerry, where they had some of the worst drunkards in Ireland. [Laughter.] If that was any amusement to hon. Members he should say that they in Kerry were not much worse than some people in that House. His point was that it was not by legislation in Ireland that they would make men sober, or even by the Sunday Closing Act, or an Early Closing Saturday Act, but by the personal influence of such temperance sons as Father Macgillacuddy, who would go into the public-houses every day of the week, including Sunday, and every hour of the day, to persuade men to stop drinking.

Colonel SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) rose in his place and claimed to move that the Question be now put.

*Mr. SPEAKER said that the Debate had not been a long one, but the question involved did not appear to be complicated, and being always unwilling to stand between the House and its desire to take a division on these Friday Bills, when he could reasonably avoid it, he would accept the Motion.

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 106; Noes, 77. (Division List No. 19.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)
Arrol, Sir William
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Baird, John George Alexander
Barry, E. (*Cork, S.*)
Bell, Richard
Bignold, Arthur
Blake, Edward
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boland, John
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, Rt Hn J A (*Glasg.*)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Craig, Charles Curtis (*Antrim, S.*
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (*Carmarthen*)
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Ffrench, Peter
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*
Gilhooly, James
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Gordon, J. (*Londonderry, S.*)
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Hammond, John
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, J. (*Midd., Tottenham*)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (*Salop*
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lundon, W.
M'Arthur, Charles (*Liverpool*)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Malcolm Ian
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norman, Henry

O'Mara, James
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(*Durham*
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Plummer, Walter R.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Roberts, John H. (*Denbighs.*)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Herbert L. (*Cleveland*)
Saunderson,Rt.HnCol.Edw.J.
Schwann, Charles E.
Smith,JamesParker (*Lanarks.*
Smith, Samuel (*Flint*)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHn.C.R(*Northants*
Sullivan, Donal
Thomson, F. W. (*York, W. R.*)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Wallace, Robert
Walton,JohnLawson(*Leeds,S.*)
Walton, Joseph (*Barnsley*)
Wason,JohnCathcart(*Orkney*)
White, Luke (*York, E. R.*)
Whiteley, George(*York, W.R.*
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, John (*Glasgow*)
Wood, James
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Sloan and Mr. O'Shaughnessy.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allsopp, Hon. George
Ambrose, Robert
Anstruther, H. T.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH
Austin, Sir John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bigwood, James
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bull, William James
Cecil, Evelyn (*Aston Manor*)
Chapman, Edward
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cullinan, J.
Davenport, William Bromley
Doogan, P. C.
Duffy, William J.
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flower, Ernest
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (*St. Albans*
Gore, Hn. S. F.Ormsby- (*Linc*
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Hy. D. (*Shrewsbury*)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hayter, Rt Hon Sir Arthur D.
Helder, Augustus
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Joyce, Michael
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (*Monm'th*)
Lawson, John Grant
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W.(*Evesham*
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Macdona, John Cumming
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Kean, John
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Montagu,Hon. J.Scott(*Hants.*
Mooney, John J.
More, Robt. Jasper(*Shropshire*
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Joseph (*Louth, South*)
O'Brien,Kendal(*Tip'eraryMid*
O'Connor,James (*Wicklow, W.*
O'Donnell, T. (*Kerry, W.*)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (*Mayo, N.*)
O'Kelly, James(*Roscommon,N*
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Purvis, Robert
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (*Waterford*
Remnant, James Farquharson
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sinclair, Louis (*Romford*)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Spencer, Sir E. (*W. Bromwich*
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Vincent,Col SirC.EH(*Sheffield*
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.CE(*Taunton*
White, Patrick (*Meath, North*
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (*York,E. R*

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Nannetti and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Question put accordingly, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House divided:—Ayes, 103; Noes, 79. (Division List No. 20.)

AYES.

Abraham, W. (*Cork, N.E.*)
Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)
Arrol, Sir William
Bagot, Capt.Josceline FitzRoy
Barry, E. (*Cork, S.*)
Bell, Richard
Bignold, Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, Rt Hn J A (*Glasg.*)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Craig,CharlesCurtis(*Antrim,S*
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (*Carmarthen*)
Delany, William
Denny, Colonel
Donelan, Captain A.
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Ffrench, Peter
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*
Gilhooly, James
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(*Elgin & Nrn*
Gordon, J. (*Londonderry, S.*)
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Hammond, John
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, J. (*Midd., Tott'ham*
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, Wm. (*Carnarvonshire*)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Law, H. Alex. (*Donegal, W.*)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Calmont, Colonel James

Malcolm, Ian
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Norman, Henry
O'Mara, James
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(*Durham*
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rattigan, Sir William Henry.
Redmond, William (*Clare*)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Roberts, John H. (*Denbighs.*)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Samuel, Herbert L. (*Cleveland*
Saunderson,Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J
Schwann, Charles E.
Smith, JamesParker (*Lanarks*
Smith, Samuel (*Flint*)
Soares, Ernest J.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(*Oxf dUniv*
Thomson, F. W. (*York, W.R.*
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Wallace, Robert
Walton,JohnLawson(*Leeds,S.*
Walton, Joseph (*Barnsley*)
Wason, John Cathcart(*Orkney*
White, Luke (*York, E.R.*)
Whiteley, George (*York, W.R.*
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, John (*Glasgow*)
Wood, James
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Sloan and Mr. O'Shaughnessy.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allsopp, Hon. George
Ambrose, Robert
Anstruther, H. T.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn.SirH.
Austin, Sir John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. G. (*Lynn Regis.*)
Bull, William James
Burke, E. Haviland
Cecil, Evelyn (*Aston Manor*)
Chapman, Edward
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cullinan, J.
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duffy, William J.
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (*St. Albans*
Gore, Hn. S. F.Ormsby- (*Linc*
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Hy. D. (*Shrewsbury*)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Helder, Augustus
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(*Salop*
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (*Monm'th*)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W.(*Evesham*
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Macdona, John Cumming
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott(*Hants.*
Mooney, John J.
More, Robt. Jasper (*Shropshire*
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Joseph (*Louth, South*)
O'Brien,Kendal(*Tipp'raryMid*
O'Connor, James (*Wicklow W.*
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (*Mayo, N.*)
O'Kelly, James (*Roscommon,N*
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Purvis, Robert
Reddy, M.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sinclair, Louis (*Romford*)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Spencer, Sir E. (*W. Bromwich*
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H(*Sheffield*
Welby,Lt-Col.A.C.E(*Taunton*
White, Patrick (*Meath, North*
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (*York, E.R*

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Nannetti and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

MR. SLOAN claimed, "That the Main Question be now put."

Main Question put accordingly, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

The House divided:—Ayes, 101; Noes, 76. (Division List No. 21.)

AYES

Abraham, W. (*Cork, N.E.*)
Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)
Arrol, Sir William
Bagot, Capt.Josceline FitzRoy
Barry, E. (*Cork, S.*)
Bell, Richard
Bignold, Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, Rt Hn J A (*Glasg.*)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Craig,CharlesCurtis(*Antrim,S*
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (*Carmarthen*)
Delany, William
Denny, Colonel
Donelan, Captain A.
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Ffrench, Peter
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*
Gilhooly, James

Gordon, Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Gordon, J. (*Londonderry, S.*)
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Hammond, John
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, J. (*Midd., Tott'ham*
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, Wm. (*Carnarvonshire*)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Law, H. Alex. (*Donegal, W.*)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Malcolm, Ian
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Norman, Henry
O'Mara, James
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (*Durham*
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Power, Patrick Joseph
Redmond, William (*Clare*)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Roberts, John H. (*Denbighs.*)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Herbert L. (*Cleveland*
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J
Schwann, Charles E.
Smith, James Parker (*Lanarks*
Smith, Samuel (*Flint*)
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (*Oxf'd Univ*
Thomson, F. W. (*York, W.R.*)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (*Leeds, S.*
Walton, Joseph (*Barnsley*)
Wason, John Cathcart (*Orkney*
White, Luke (*York, E.R.*)
Whiteley, George (*York, W.R.*
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, John (*Glasgow*)
Wood, James
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Sloan and Mr. O'Shaughnessy.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allsopp, Hon. George
Ambrose, Robert
Anstruther, H. T.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bull, William James
Burke, E. Haviland
Cecil, Evelyn (*Aston Manor*)
Chapman, Edward
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cullinan, J.
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duffy, William J.
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (*St. Albans*
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (*Linc*
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Hy. D. (*Shrewsbury*)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Helder, Augustus
Horner, Frederick William
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (*Salop*
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (*Monm'th*)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (*Evesham*
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Macdona, John Cumming
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (*Hants.*
Mooney, John J.
More, Robt. Jasper (*Shropshire*
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Joseph (*Louth, South*)
O'Brien, Kendal (*Tip'erary Mid*
O'Connor James (*Wicklow, W.*
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (*Mayo, N.*)
O'Kelly, James (*Roscommon, N*
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Purvis, Robert
Reddy, M.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sinclair, Louis (*Romford*)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Spencer, Sir E. (*W. Bromwich*
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (*Sheffield*
White, Patrick (*Meath, North*
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (*York, E.R.*

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Nannetti and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL.)

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON reported from the Chairmen's Panel: That they had appointed Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON further reported from the Chairmen's Panel: That they had agreed to the following Resolution: That any Member of the Chairmen's Panel be and he is hereby empowered to ask any other Member of the Chairmen's Panel to take his place in case of necessity.

Report to lie upon the Table.

Adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 9th March, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:

Hamilton, Motherwell, and Wishaw Tramways [H.L.]. The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Electric Lighting (London) Bill [H.L.], referred to the Examiners.

Birmingham District Tramways Bill [H.L.]. Order for the meeting of the Standing Orders Committee on Thursday next, discharged.

Birmingham Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Brighton Corporation Bill [H.L.]; King's College, London, Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Bill [H.L.], Reports from His Majesty's Attorney General received, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Didcot, Newbury, and Southampton Railway Bill [H.L.]; Harrow and Stanmore Gas Bill [H.L.]; Taff Vale Railway Bill [H.L.]; London and North-Western Railway Bill [H.L.]; North's Navigation Collieries Bill [H.L.], read 2^{a}.

Birmingham Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Brighton Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Exeter Corporation Bill [H.L.]; King's College (London) Bill [H.L.], read 2^{a} (according to order).

Antrim, Down, Armagh, and Belfast Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Aston Manor Improvement Bill [H.L.]; Belfast Water Bill [H.L.]; Bournemouth Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Bristol Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Bury and District Joint Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Carmarthenshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Chard Corporation Gas and Electricity Bill [H.L.]; Frinton-on-Sea Sea Defences Bill [H.L.]; Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill [H.L.]; Nantwich Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; North-Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill [H.L.]; committed; The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Oldham Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Rochester Corporation Tramways and Improvements Bill [H.L.]; Salford Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Scunthorpe Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]; Shropshire, Worcestershire, and East Denbighshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Southampton Harbour Bill [H.L.]; Sutton Coldfield Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Torquay Corporation Water Bill [H.L.]; Willesden Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Worthing Corporation (Tramways) Bill [H.L.]; committed; The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Harrogate Water Bill [H.L.]; Hastings Harbour Bill; committed.

PETITIONS.

SHOPS (EARLY CLOSING) BILL [H.L.].

Petitions in favour of: of Traders' Defence Association of Scotland; and Glasgow Municipal Debating Society; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

BANGOR DIOCESE.

Petitions in favour of restoration of patronage of certain benefices to the Bishop of Bangor: of clergymen in the rural deaneries of Twrcelyn; Archllechwedd; Talybolion; Eifionydd; Tyndaethway; Menai; Arwystli; Arvon; Maltraeth; Lleyn; Cyfeiliog Mawddwy; and Estimaur; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NATAL.

Ordered that the Order of Monday last that the "Northern Districts Annexation Act, 1902," do lie on the Table, be discharged.

LIGHT LOAD LINE.

The evidence taken before the Select Committee from time to time to be printed, but no copies to be delivered except to members of the Committee, and to such other persons as the Committee shall think fit, until further order.

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Lists of public elementary schools and training colleges under the administration of the Board, 1902–1903.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

ARMY (ESTIMATES).

Abstract of Army Estimates, 1903–1904 (ordinary services only) compared with corresponding figures for 1902–1903.

NAVAL RESERVES.

Report of the Naval Reserves Committee; with appendices.

SEWAGE DISPOSAL (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Third Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire and report what methods of treating and disposing of sewage may properly be adopted, together with Minutes of Evidence, Vols. I. and II.

EMIGRATION STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Report and tables for the year 1902.

CHURCH ESTATES COMMISSION.

Fifty-second Report from the Church Estates Commissioners, for the year preceding 1st March, 1903.

Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table.

CHURCH TEMPORALITIES (IRELAND).

Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General upon the account of the Irish Land Commission in respect of Church Temporalities in Ireland, for the year ended 31st March, 1902, together with the account for the above period and that from 26th July, 1869 (the date of the Irish Church Act), to 31st March, 1902.

BUILDING SOCIETIES.

Eighth Annual Report by the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies of the Proceedings of the Registrars under the Building Societies Acts; with an abstract of the Annual Accounts and Statements of Societies for the year 1902. Part I. Report.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

INTRUSIVE PATRONAGE IN NORTH WALES.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY (who had the following Notice on the Paper, viz., " To ask the Earl Stanhope if he can explain why the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in 1835 recommended the union of the sees of Bangor and St. Asaph in order to endow Manchester, and alterations of episcopal patronage; and if he can justify the act of the Ecclesiastical Commission, by which in 1861 the patronage of twenty-four benefices situated in the Dioceses of Bangor and St. Asaph, and belonging to the Bishops of those Sees, was transferred to the Bishop of Llandaff, notwithstanding the divergence of the languages spoken in North and South Wales, and the fact that the 'magnitude of the See' had been largely increased prior to the transfer, and other circumstances which militate against the transfer; and whether he will take into his consideration the necessity of obtaining powers to rectify this transfer by the restitution on the occasion of the next vacancy of the See of Llandaff of this patronage to the North Wales Sees, and to present petitions from the Archdeaconries of Bangor and Merioneth ") said: My Lords, I am indebted to the courtesy of my noble friend to whom my Question is addressed for the correct date of the alienation from Bangor and St. Asaph of the benefices referred to in the Notice; also for the information that although the Ecclesiastical Commission had the power to transfer these benefices to Llandaff, it had no power to restore them to the Sees to which they belonged. I have petitions to present from twelve rural deaneries in the Bangor Diocese praying for the restoration of their patronage to the Bishops of Bangor and St. Asaph. No movement in this direction was made by the Bangor clergy in the time of the Bishop, Dr. Campbell, because he discouraged it owing to a feeling of personal obligation to the then Bishop of Llandaff.

It may be as well to give the history of this alienation or transfer of North Wales benefices to the South Wales Sees. It arose from the recommendation of a Royal Commission, which made a first Report on March 17th, 1835. The Report gives hardly any clue to its motives or reasons for its recommendations. Many of its recommendations were never carried out, others were carried out and were rescinded later. One of these was for the abolition of the See of Bangor and the constituting of one Diocese for North Wales for the purpose of endowing a See for Manchester. That is to say that North Wales, which is poor, was to be plundered for opulent Lancashire. This led to remonstrances from the North Wales clergy, and this scheme was dropped. It is said that its final overthrow was due to Lord Powis, the grandfather of the present Earl, and this good work of his is commemorated on his tomb at Welshpool. The See of Sodor and Man was to be abolished by uniting it to Carlisle. This also was dropped. Bristol and Gloucester were united to form the See of Ripon, but Bristol was later separated again from Gloucester. It is supposed that this abolition of one See in order to form another arose from a superstition that there could only be twenty-six Bishops. It might have been discovered sooner that all the new Bishops need not have seats in this House.

I have asked my noble friend if he can explain this conduct of the Royal Commission of 1835. He may reply that he was not born then, but he may have found some explanation in the archives of the Ecclesiastical Commission, or he might say that this would be only an academical discussion. I submit that it is not so, since the Reports of this Commission are sufficient to justify the contempt expressed by the noble Marquess, the late Prime Minister, for Royal Commissions, and an examination of its composition may show how Royal Commissions might be made more effective than they have been. This Commission was composed of men of the highest position in the land, and with one exception of undoubted intellectual capacity. These Commissioners were all men of too high a position, burdened with too many other occupations, and with too little local knowledge to be able to estimate properly suggestions which must have been made in a doctrinaire spirit, without any regard to local feelings or requirements, and in direct opposition to the principle so often laid down by the late Prime Minister, namely, that the provision for the spiritual needs of a locality must be preserved to that locality. Those who signed this Report were: The Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Lyndhurst (Chancellor), the Archbishop of York, Lord Harrowby, the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Lincoln, the Bishop of Gloucester, Sir Robert Peel (Prime Minister), Mr. Henry Goulburn, Sir Charles Watkin Wynn, Mr. Henry Hobhouse, and Sir Herbert Jenner. Sir Robert Peel was not impartial in the matter of the Manchester See, for he was born and bred in the cotton atmosphere of Manchester. This greed of Manchester will be understood by those who remember its recent conduct with regard to the import duties in India on cotton goods, and, later, the excise duties on Indian cottons.

Some light is thrown upon the composition of Commissions by a Madras paper, *United India*, written in English by Indians. That paper states that Lord Curzon has issued more Commissions than any other Viceroy; there were four sitting at once. That on University Education has been a complete failure. The members of these Commissions are the highest officials, who are taken away from their own work, which has to be done by others, who require, and get, more pay. All these Commissions appear to be too numerous, so that responsibility is diminished or frittered away. I am also indebted to the noble Earl to whom my question is addressed for the information that the Commission of which he is the first or principal lay member, does not promote legislation. In the case of these South Wales patronages it will not be needed. I must ask him to excuse me if my Notice has seemed to attribute to him more powers than he thinks he possesses; but his predecessor, Lord Chichester, was always considered to be the first Ecclesiastical Commissioner, and I think it is since the late Lord Chichester's time that the Secretary of the Commission has acquired that predominance or preponderance which has given rise to so much complaint, and which has caused the *Church Times* of 28th November last to say that for all practical purposes and matters of detail he is the Ecclesiastical Commission. Indeed, preponderance is not the right word so much as the Italian *prepotenza*, which means supreme authority, but in the modern acceptation of the word, arrogant and arrogated authority.

The system of patronage by a Bishop in the Diocese of another Bishop is altogether wrong in principle. It is absurd to suppose that any amount of patronage would raise a new See, such as Liverpool or Manchester, to the level of Salisbury. A friend of mine wrote to me about the anomalies of Episcopal patronage, and gave as an instance the patronage of a parish close to London by a distant Bishop; but he seemed not to know that these anomalies are entirely modern and are due to the Report of the Ecclesiastical Royal Commission of 1835. The Most Reverend the Primate has no personal experience of the inconveniences of this intrusive patronage, because Winchester has not been plundered and has received no share of the plunder of others. Of the English Sees affected by the intrusive patronage caused by taking away patronage from some Sees to increase the magnitude or importance of other Sees, if the alienated patronage were restored, the greatest gainers would be—Hereford, 18; Durham, 15; Bath and Wells, 11; Lincoln, 10; Southwell, 9; Chichester, 8; Salisbury, 7; Ely, 5; Canterbury, 5; and York, 4. The losers would be—Worcester, 28; London, 19; Manchester, 18; Chester, 16; Oxford, 7; Peterborough, 5; Ripon, 5; Norwich, 2; Gloucester, 1; and Lincoln, 1.

The See of St. David's also possesses the patronage of six benefices within the Diocese of St. Asaph, and the right rev. prelate who presides over St. David's has given me leave to explain why I omitted including his See and patronage in my Notice. It was because I was aware that he was seeking to restore these to St. Asaph by means of exchanges, also that that right rev. prelate had nothing to defend either in the present nor in the past, that is, in the time of his predecessors; and having been Dean of St. Asaph he is well acquainted with that Diocese.

The clergy who remonstrated against the suppression of the Bangor See and its fusion with St. Asaph pointed out that it would be difficult for a Bishop residing at St. Asaph to know the circumstances of parishes in Anglesey, and that it would be a hardship for the clergy to have to make a journey of fifty miles to see their Bishop. This objection applies with greater force to Sees as distant as the South Wales Sees. These objections have lately been set forth in a letter to me by a Church dignitary in Wales, who writes—

> "Parishes, like individuals, have their peculiarities, and surely it is a part of the Bishop's office to choose a round peg for a round hole. A man who would be an utter failure in one parish may be fairly successful in a parish differently circumstanced; this important part of a Bishop's office cannot be discharged by a Bishop living 200 miles away, amidst different surroundings as regards men and manners."

The differences of the Welsh spoken in North and South Wales are by no means the chief reasons why these North Wales benefices ought to be restored to the Northern Sees. They have been put down in the Notice because they are the most self-evident, and admit of being stated in the fewest words. As to the divergence of the dialects of North and South Wales, which some are inclined to minimise, an Anglesey Rector, who is a native of South Wales, an Oxford man, writes to me—

> "Although I have had exceptional advantages in having been an intimate friend at Oxford of an Anglesey man, and frequently, if not almost invariably talked Welsh with him, and although I have been resident in North Wales since I was ordained sixteen years ago, I still find myself using expressions which puzzle my hearers, and sometimes hear words and forms of expression which are strange to me. This applies more to private conversation than to public ministration, though the consciousness of being liable to use unintelligible words or phrases interferes with one's freedom when speaking extempore, or from notes. Written compositions are of course free from colloquial expressions, and are therefore less likely to offend. The difficulty is aggravated in the case of men from Llandaff, as the Glamorganshire dialect is less intelligible and more repugnant to the ears of North Welshmen than that of Mid Wales."

Another strong reason for discontinuing the introduction of South Wales clergymen into North Wales parishes is the great ill-feeling, amounting to contempt, exhibited by the people of North Wales towards those of South Wales, which must detract from the efficacy of the ministrations of South Wales clergy. When I first came to live in Wales, I thought it unreasonable that such feelings should be excited by a geographical division. I then thought that these feelings were probably confined to agricultural labourers and farmers. Later I found that these feelings extended to all classes of habitual residents in Wales; and that consequently the landowners in North and South Wales had separate associations for their defence, though that of South Wales found it advisable to employ the North Wales barrister.

Further investigation proved to me that these feelings had more reasonable grounds than a fanciful and arbitrary geographical division, and that they were founded on ancient tribal differences. These tribal distinctions and differences began, or were first recorded, in the time of the Romans. History records, in a fine passage of Tacitus, the stand made by the men and women of the Ordovices or men of North Wales in Anglesey against Suetonius Paulinus. History also relates the ineffective resistance of the Silures or South Walians, under Caractacus or Caradoc, against Ostorius and other Roman Generals, and his betrayal to the Romans by his mother-in-law. Tacitus says this occurred in the ninth year of the struggle, but he does not seem to have thought much either of Caractacus or his opponent Ostorius. Caractacus has obtained more favour on account of his speech when a prisoner before Claudius, attributed to him by Tacitus, than for any warlike prowess or success. But the best point in that speech is his surprise that the Romans, who possessed such opulence at home, should deem it worth their while to fight for the hovels of Britain. This passage, given in Dr. Lingard's history, is not to be found in the speech as recorded by Tacitus, it stands on the authority of the Byzantine historian Zonaras, who wrote about the year 1100. It is, however, more probable that the ill-feeling of the people of North Wales for the South Wales people began, or became more accentuated, in Anglo-Saxon times, when the South Wales people, who had become effeminate by Roman culture and civilisation in a greater degree than those of North Wales, succumbed more readily to the Saxons, and later to the Normans, and so became an object of contempt to the men of North Wales, who at present always speak of them as Hwntus. This word is not to be found in the dictionaries. From the tone in which it is pronounced, it would seem to be a very opprobrious epithet; but it really only means those who are beyond; as they say in North Wales, beyond the pale of civilisation, or beyond the pale of Wales proper; or, as they say in South Wales, beyond the river Dovey.

The actual result of transferring patronage from the North Wales Sees to those of South Wales has been as bad in practice as could be expected from a transfer made on a false principle, that of increasing the "magnitude" or importance of the South Wales Sees, and in ignorance of, or disregard of the circumstances. The results in the case of St. David's have not been anything like those that have attended the exercise of the Llandaff patronage. This may be owing to two causes; first, that St. David's had only six patronages in North Wales whilst Llandaff had twenty-four; and secondly, that the staff of the Llandaff Diocesan officials appear to have written over their pigeon-holes relating to the Bangor and St. Asaph Dioceses, "Rubbish may be shot here." As I said before, that the right reverend Prelate who presides over the See of St. David's has little or nothing to defend in the present or in the past, whilst the Llandaff patronage shows fourteen or fifteen cases of bad appointments out of twenty-four since the year 1869 up to the present time. Of these, four have been appointed by the present occupant of the See of Llandaff. The complaints against these incumbents vary in character, from deficiency in the knowledge of Welsh where Welsh is required, extreme old age and voicelessness, want of mental ability, quarrelsomeness, or being what is called a "crank."

As to two cases I can give further details. One is that of a Llandaff appointment made in 1869 to Trefriw, in Carnarvonshire. This Rector can have little time for his spiritual duties, as he has become a sort of Whiteley. He is the principal owner of the bridge connecting the town with Llanrwst, and its tolls; he has a bakehouse, and a grocery, a blacksmith's shop, and a farm; a public-house where he keeps a manager, and it is said provides the liquors; he has also a flannel factory, and besides infringing Canon law by trading, he, as I am told, infringes Statute law, which prohibits a clergyman from belonging to a company of less than eight, since he has formed a nominal or bogus company of his own relatives, all sleeping partners. If this incumbent were a layman there would be no fault to find with him.

A worse case is that of the Rector of Llanrug, Carnarvonshire, appointed in 1879. His conduct was such that the Bishop of Bangor had to appoint a commission of inquiry about him, and he has been inhibited from his clerical duties. The *Liverpool Courier* of 5th December, 1901, published a letter from the diocesan clerk with the report of the Commission. The substance of this was that the population of Llanrug was 3,500; that besides the parish church, there was a mission church; that the net yearly stipend of the incumbent was £142; that besides that he received from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners £60 a year, £50 a year from the Church Pastoral Aid Society, and £10 a year locally subscribed for the stipend of an assistant curate licensed by the Bishop; that this curate had not been able to perform all his clerical duties (it is not stated why); that during the last twelve months, or thereabouts, the Sunday services at the district of Cwmyglo had been conducted by a layman not licensed by the Bishop, and a quarryman by occupation; that from the evidence before the Commissioners it appeared that the incumbent had for a money consideration, of which no account was produced, allotted both to parishioners and non-parishioners parts of the churchyard of the parish for use as burial places at some future date; that the baptisms had not been duly entered in the Register book, and there had been more lay baptisms than were necessary; that the ecclesiastical duties of the benefice were inadequately performed, owing to the negligence of the incumbent, and that no medical evidence of his ill-health was put forward.

For my own part I must observe that when the diocesan clerk, in his letter to the *Liverpool Courier*, says that this anticipated sale of grave spaces in the churchyard to non-parishioners is unjust to the parishioners, at whose expense the larger portion of the churchyard had been provided, he understates the nature of this act, which was one of criminal fraud and obtaining money under false pretences, since the incumbent pocketed the money for sales which were not valid, and which were not binding on the successor of this incumbent. I can only suppose that this unduly mild euphemism was adopted to avoid recourse to a criminal prosecution.

I have one further point to urge, one which principally concerns the right rev. Prelate who presides over the See of Llandaff, and which should have more weight with him than with others whom I am addressing. I should mention that since the beginning of the year I have received what I might call an Episcopal New Year's card, or printed leaflet, commencing with three collects. The first of these prays for the cleansing of the Church, and I submit that the twenty-four benefices now alienated from Bangor and St. Asaph may require this treatment, and that unless they are restored to those Sees, humanly speaking the best way for their present patron to cleanse them would be to follow the classical precedent and to turn the river Dovey through them. The third of these collects prays that those for whom the prayer is made may be enabled to follow the examples of departed saints. This is what I hope the right rev. Prelate who presides over Llandaff will do, when I remind him that his first predecessor in his See, St. Dubricius, voluntarily resigned to St. David the See of Caerleon. St. David at first refused this cession with tears, but was at length overruled by the Synod, and accepted it. I am happy to be able to say that the right rev. Prelate who presides over Llandaff is prepared to follow in the footsteps of his predecessor in the See, St. Dubricius, and to treat the Bishops of Bangor and St. Asaph in the same fraternal spirit as that which was manifested between St. Dubricius and St. David; for he has written to me that he—

> "Desires to assure me that if the object I have in view can be attained without depriving the See of Llandaff of the Patronage of which it is at present possessed, by the transfer to it of that of other Benefices in place of those which it now holds in North Wales, he will be quite ready to give all the help in his power to effect it."

Lord Stanley of Alderley.

There ought to be no difficulty in arriving at a satisfactory solution of this matter, and I hope it will be settled in a Christian spirit, and not that of Shylock. I would explain why I have given all these details, instead of confining myself to stating the terms of the letter of the Bishop of Llandaff. It is because I thought it necessary to attempt to make a practicable breach in the wall of self-satisfaction which surrounds the office which the noble Earl presides over, but does not control; because it was necessary to show the necessity for restitution, and to vindicate the North Wales men for their aversion to natives of South Wales; to discourage haggling on the terms of exchange, and unreasonable expectations on both sides of a whole pound of flesh or more: lastly, for the satisfaction of the Right Rev. Prelate, who printed and circulated the collects which have been so efficacious in obtaining a fortunate result.

*EARL STANHOPE: My Lords, I shall not attempt to follow the noble Lord in his somewhat lengthy speech, but shall confine myself to answering the Question as it stands upon the Paper. The object which the noble Lord has in view is a very good one, but I may say that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, of which I am a humble member, have nothing to do with patronage or with the transfer of patronage. The transfer of ecclesiastical patronage is no doubt that which was affected by a scheme of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners ratified by an Order of Her late Majesty in Council on July 25, 1861, referred to in the Commissioners' fourteenth Report in 1862. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners have no power to effect a retransfer of the patronage of the benefices in question unless it be by way of exchange at the request of the Bishops and with the concurrence of the Archbishop. The transfer was made with a view to carrying out in Wales the direction contained in the Act of 6 and 7 William IV., chap. 77, which, after providing for a general rearrangement of the boundaries of the English and Welsh dioceses, enacted as follows—

> "That such alterations be made in the apportionment or exchange of ecclesiastical patronage among the several Bishops as shall be consistent with the relative magnitude and importance of their dioceses when newly arranged, and as shall afford an adequate quantity of patronage to the Bishops of the new Sees."

It was necessary to supplement the amount of patronage enjoyed by the two southern dioceses of Llandaff and St. David's, and as, under the Act, only episcopal patronage could be affected, the increased patronage which had to be found for the southern Welsh Bishoprics could only be provided out of the north Sees.

REGISTRATION OF LAND WRITS IN SCOTLAND.

*THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH), who had given notice—"To call attention to the system of registration of writs relating to heritable property in Scotland, and to present a Bill"—said: My Lords, I am afraid I must admit that the subject which I propose to call attention very shortly to this afternoon is one of a highly technical character, but it is not controversial, and I hope your Lordships will have no difficulty to-night in allowing the Bill which I shall present to be read a first time, and that it may subsequently pass into law. The land register, with which the Bill deals, is really the general register of all transactions connected with heritable property in Scotland; it is really the land register for the whole of Scotland. The order in which writs relating to this class of property are registered fixes the priority of title, and therefore registration is practically compulsory of every writ connected with land, and has been compulsory for a very long period of years. There are considerably over 40,000 such writs registered every year, and therefore the business which is done in this office is not only of a very large and complicated, but of a most important, kind. The method which is followed at present is that when a writ is presented for registration it is entered in what is known as the Presentment Book for the county in which it is desired that it should be recorded. A careful Minute of each writ has to be made, and this, of course, is skilled work, involving conveyancing knowledge of a high-class character, which has to be correspondingly paid for. This Minute Book is made accessible to the public as soon as possible, and the transactions of each year are bound up separately for the year and preserved, each year separately by itself. In addition to the Minute which I have mentioned, there is also what is known as a search-sheet. This document is kept upon a different principle. It is not a general register, but a particular register kept in a series of books in ledger form, and it is cross indexed both under the names of persons and places, and from an examination of this search-sheet may be seen the burdens and transactions which have affected every property for the last thirty-five or forty years.

At present all writs sent for registration have to be engrossed and copied at length. This is work also of an important kind, and every writ is collated twice; that is, after it has been engrossed it has to be read, and read a second time, so as to make sure that it is accurately transcribed. This is very laborious work, and I am told that the work of collating the different writs is very much more trying and very much more disliked than the actual copying out of the writs themselves. Various inconveniences have been found in the past at certain times of the year. Your Lordships know that almost all transactions in land in Scotland take place at one or other of the two terms Martinmas and Whitsunday, and a considerable rush to have writs registered arises in consequence. A strong Committee, presided over by one of the Judges of the Court of Session, was appointed by myself a few years ago, and upon that Committee there were represented not only the Treasury, but different branches of the legal profession. They made a unanimous Report in the direction that the existing system of control and the procedure are confused and require regulation, that the present practice under which every writ is engrossed and then twice collated by the clerks of the establishment has very serious disadvantages, that the amount of labour involved is very great, and various suggestions have been made from time to time for getting over these difficulties. It has been suggested that the writs should be printed, but this Committee to which I have alluded reported that printing would not save either time or money, and it would not do away with the necessity of most carefully collating every writ after it had been printed, and there would also be this great disadvantage, that there would be a considerable risk of loss or damage because the writs themselves would have to be entrusted to the printers.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh.

The Committee therefore reported against printing the writs, but in favour of a process which is called photo-zincography. I must apologise to your Lordships for the use of such an apparently barbarous term, but it is, I understand, a process of photographing the writs on zinc plate. This is not a new process; it is used in the Ordnance Survey Department. It has also been used for the reproduction of the Doomsday Book and many historical documents. I understand it was also used for the reproduction of the Book of Common Prayer which is kept in the Library of your Lordships' House. Very exhaustive experiments have been made with regard to this process. The whole of the writs registered for the county of Fife for a month, over 200 in number, have been carefully reproduced by this process for the use of the Committee. There is, I believe, a general consensus of opinion that this process, if it could be made legal, which is the object of this Bill, would work a very great improvement in the present system. The writs, being reproduced by photography, must necessarily be exact facsimiles of the original. Many more copies can be got with much less labour than by writing, and the process can be so carried on that the writs, although exposed to the photographing process, need never leave the possession of those who are responsible for their custody. I have had placed in the Library of the House copies of the writs which were reproduced before this Committee. They are bound in volume form, and in case any of your Lordships might wish to see them the volumes will remain for some weeks in the Library.

I do not anticipate any real difficulty about it, but the urgency of the matter is this, that considerable extensions are being made to the Register House in Edinburgh, and we have now arrived at the stage when it must be decided whether the upper storeys of this building are to be prepared for people who are to sit writing, or for those who are to use this process of photography. The Treasury have given their consent to the introduction of this Bill. I believe that there is no doubt that a certain saving will result from the adoption of the process, although that, I am bound to say, neither on the part of the Scottish Office nor the Treasury, is the real reason for the introduction of this Bill. We believe it will be a process better in itself, more suitable for the purpose for which this preservation of writs is designed, and one which will really afford the possibility of more copies being produced for preservation and circulation to those concerned. I hope that with this explanation your Lordships will give the Bill a First Reading.

On Question, Bill read 1ª. To be printed. (No. 1.)

PENSIONS FOR MASTER MARINERS.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I beg to ask His Majesty's Government what proportion of the annual income of the Corporation of Trinity House is expended in pensions to decayed masters of the Mercantile Marine; whether applicants must, before any consideration is given to their applications for such pensions, be nominated by any particular person or persons; and whether there are any other funds in the hands of the Government which are available for grants to decayed masters of the Mercantile Marine.

LORD WOLVERTON: My Lords, I have to thank the noble Lord for the courtesy he has shown to the Board of Trade in delaying his Question for some days in order that we might get the necessary information. We have had considerable correspondence with other Offices, and I am now able to give the noble Lord an answer which I hope will prove satisfactory. The Board of Trade has no jurisdiction with regard to the charitable funds of the Corporation of Trinity House, which are administered under a scheme of the Charity Commissioners. They have, however, been furnished with the following information by the courtesy of the Elder Brethren:—The Corporation are trustees of certain charitable funds out of which pensions are granted to decayed master mariners and others. Some of the appointments to these pensions are made by the Corporation upon the nomination of the Elder Brethren individually, in turn as vacancies occur. The accounts showing the disposal of these funds are rendered to the Charity Commissioners in the usual manner. With regard to the latter portion of the Question, pensions are granted by the Board of Trade (1) from moneys voted by Parliament to masters who contributed to the Merchant Seamen's Fund previous to August, 1851, and who continued their contribution during the period of their service at sea; (2) from the Greenwich Sixpenny Fund to masters who served at sea for at least five years previous to January 1, 1835, and who contributed 6d. a month during that period.

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 9th March, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

A POINT OF ORDER.

***SIR E. DURNING-LAWRENCE** (Cornwall, Truro): Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to an ungentlemanly act performed this morning by a Member of this House.

***MR. SPEAKER**: The hon. Member had better state what is the act he has to complain of.

***SIR E. DURNING-LAWRENCE**: A Member came here this morning and wrote the names of two other Members on cards, and placed them on this bench. And this he did knowing that it was not in accordance with the Rules of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, it is not in order for hon. Members to place tickets in the brass sockets in the absence of those hon. Members whose names are on the tickets.

***Sir E. DURNING-LAWRENCE**: Is it in order for one hon. Member to write the name of another hon. Member on the card ?

***Mr. SPEAKER**: I have on former occasions stated that hon. Members who desire to secure places must come to the House themselves.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): This arises out of the Fourth Party.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz.—

Great Eastern Railway (No. 1) Bill; Great Eastern Railway (No. 2) Bill. Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

Bridgwater Gas Bill; Broadstairs Gas Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Commercial Gas Bill; Coventry Electric Tramways Bill; Crystal Palace District Gas Bill; East Ardsley Gas Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Gorleston and Southtown Gas Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Great Northern Railway Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Great Western Railway (Pension Fund) Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Ipswich Gas Bill; London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Maidstone Gas Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Midland Railway Bill; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill; North Middlesex Gas Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Scarborough Gas Bill; Sittingbourne District Gas Bill; Sutton District Water Bill; Walker and Wallsend Union Gas Bill; Winchester Water and Gas Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Wood Green Urban District Council Bill. [By Order] Read a second time, and committed.

PETITIONS.

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Peebles; Kinnaird; Langholm; Dunisdeer; Tynron; Dunblane; Balmaclellan; Birsay; Caddonfoot; Cairney; Carsphairn; Cluny; Burness; Dalton; Durris; Elie; Gairloch; Glasgow; Wigtown; Kildrummy; Kiltarlity; Kincardine O'Niel; Lady; Leuchars; Markinch; Melrose; Minnigaff; Minto; Mochrum; Moulin; New Deer; Penninghame; Polwarth; Roxburgh; Strichen; St. Fergus; Stow; Tannadice; Tough; Tundergarth; and Whithorn; to lie upon the Table.

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE.

Petition from Bradford, for extension to Women; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petitions against: from Sheffield; Gateshead; and Canterbury; to lie upon the Table.

BRITISH MUSEUM.

Petition [presented 26th February] referred to the Committee of Supply.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY ESTIMATES (ABSTRACT).

Copy presented, of Abstract of Army Estimates, 1903–4 (Ordinary Services only), compared with corresponding Figures for 1902–3 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CHURCH ESTATES COMMISSION.

Copy presented, of Fifty-second Report from the Church Estates Commissioners for the year preceding 1st March 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SEWAGE DISPOSAL (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy presented, of Third Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire and report what methods of Treating and Disposing of Sewage may properly be adopted, together with Minutes of Evidence, Vols. I. and II. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EMIGRATION STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Emigration Statistics of Ireland for the year 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, ETC.).

Copy presented, of Lists of Public Elementary Schools and Training Colleges under the Administration of the Board, 1902–3 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVAL RESERVES.

Copy presented, of Report of the Naval Reserves Committee, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Papers laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House:—

CHURCH TEMPORALITIES (IRELAND).

Copy of Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General upon the account of the Irish Land Commission in respect of Church Temporalities in Ireland for the year ended 31st March, 1902 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 64.]

BUILDING SOCIETIES.

Copy of Eighth Annual Report by the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies of the proceedings of the Registrars under the Building Societies Acts, etc. [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 65.]

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS FUNDS.

Return ordered, "showing the amounts and values of Government Stock, Bills and Bonds, Annuities, and other securities standing in the names of the National Debt Commissioners on account of the Post Office Savings Banks Fund on 31st December, 1902; together with any dividends accrued but not received up to such date."—(*Mr. Channing.*)

PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (CONTRIBUTIONS BY GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS).

Return ordered, "of the number of Public Elementary Schools, classified into Board, Church of England, Wesleyan, Roman Catholic, British, and other Undenominational Schools, which have received for the years 1900–1901, 1901–1902 (1) Annual Grants, (2) Contributions from the Commissioners of Woods and Forests or any other Government Department not being the Board of Education, together with the total sum in each case given to each class of school."—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

ADVERTISEMENTS (FOREIGN COUNTRIES).

Address for "Return of the laws, if any, in force in France, Germany, Austria, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and the United States: (1) for regulating or restricting the exhibition of posters, bills, and other public advertisements; and (2) for the taxation of such advertisements."—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Treatment of Persons convicted under the Vaccination Acts.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that two men, named Pick and Cokin, were arrested at Hinckley on 27th February for non-payment of fines and costs incurred under the Vaccination Acts, and were handcuffed before being conveyed to prison; will he state by whose authority they were handcuffed; and will he take steps to see that such treatment is not again employed under similar circumstances.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*) On my attention being drawn to this case I called for a report from the local police and find that the facts are as stated in the Question. No special authority is needed for the use of handcuffs in the case of prisoners when the police have reason to fear that without them they may be unable to carry out the warrant of commitment. In the present instance it appears that the officers charged with this duty considered that handcuffs were necessary to prevent the execution of the warrant being frustrated. I am not prepared to say that this opinion was not justified. The necessity for handcuffs must depend upon the circumstances of each case, though I am certainly of opinion that they should not be used except for very good reasons.

New Naval Base—Claims of the Tyne.

MR. PLUMMER (Newcastle-on-Tyne): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether due notice will be given of any decision the Admiralty may arrive at in favour of establishing a Naval base on the North-East Coast, and, in that event, and before the selection of any particular port, whether an opportunity will be given to the public authorities associated with the Tyne to set forth the claims of that river for selection by the Admiralty.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) This matter was dealt with by the First Lord of the Treasury in reply to a Question asked by the hon. and gallant Member for Yarmouth on the 5th instant,† and I ask leave to refer the hon. Member to that answer.

Carriage of Agricultural Produce in Denmark—Subsidies to Steamers.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state the extent and conditions of the subsidies granted by the Danish Government to steamers conveying agricultural produce from Denmark.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) I would call the attention of the hon. Member to Section 14, page 8, of the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Steamship Subsidies, and the statement in the Appendix therein referred to.

Uganda Railway—Material.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will present to the House a Return giving particulars of the dates upon which the permanent way materials, rails, sleepers, rolling stock, and iron bridge work used in the construction of the Uganda Railway were purchased, the firms from whom they were obtained, and the prices paid therefor.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The preparation of such a Return would involve a very large amount of time and labour, and in the interests of the public service the Secretary of State would hesitate to assent to it unless it could be shown to serve some purpose of importance.

Cotton Cloths Factories Acts.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in the sixty-three cases reported by the inspector under the Cotton Cloths Factories Act as having exceeded the nine volumes of carbon dioxide in every 10,000 volumes, a previous notice had at any time been issued for defective ventilation; and, if so, will he say in how many cases.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*) Previous notices had been sent within twelve months to the same occupiers in sixteen of the cases referred to, and at longer intervals to thirty-five such occupiers.

Cost of Military Aid to Civil Power—Suggested Legislation.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether any Bill has yet been prepared by his Department for placing the cost of military aid rendered to the civil power upon the local authorities for which military assistance may in future be asked; and whether he proposes to introduce such a Bill this session.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I have a Bill on this subject in preparation, and I shall be glad if I can find an opportunity to introduce it this session; but I am not able to make any promise.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxviii., 1551.

Musical Copyright.

Mr. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley): To ask Mr. Attorney General whether, in view of the piracy of copyright musical publications, the Government contemplate introducing at an early date a measure to amend the Musical Copyright Act.

(*Answered by Sir Robert Finlay.*) Consideration will be given to any reasonable proposals made by those interested in this matter for the amendment of the Act of last Session.

Land Transfer Act—Registration of Titles.

Mr. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn): To ask Mr. Attorney General whether, in view of the fact that possessory titles to land which are now being registered under the Order in Council applying the compulsory provisions of the Land Transfer Act, 1897, to the County of London cannot mature into absolute titles, he will consider the expediency of suspending the further registration of possessory titles until a scheme for facilitating the registration of absolute titles can be formulated.

(*Answered by Sir Robert Finlay.*) This question has been considered, and it is not thought desirable to suspend the further registration of possessory titles. I may remind my hon. and learned friend of the Order of 10th February of this year, under the Land Transfer Act, for facilitating applications for the registration of absolute titles; and, although the Act does not provide that possessory titles shall mature into absolute titles, it is considered that their registration should not be suspended, as they will in the future occupy an advantageous position with reference to further registration which is now under consideration.

Grievances of Customs Assistant Clerks.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether a petition, addressed by the Assistant Clerks (Abstractors) in the Customs Statistical Office to the Lords of the Treasury in the month of June last, has been received by them; and, if so, whether he can state when a reply will be given.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) Yes, Sir, and a reply will shortly be sent.

Education Act—Schemes for Approval.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he will state how many schemes, in pursuance of the Education (England and Wales) Act, 1902, have been submitted to the Board of Education for counties, county boroughs, boroughs, and urban districts, and how many have received final approval.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) No schemes have yet been approved by the Board, since none can be approved until after the period of publication required by section 17 of the Act has elapsed. Out of the sixty-two County Councils in England and Wales, forty-one have submitted draft schemes for the approval of the Board. Of these, twenty-one are now in course of publication. The corresponding figures for the other local authorities are as set out below.

	Schemes now published.	Schemes formally submitted.	Total Number.
County Councils -	21	41	62
County Borough Councils - -	12	39	69
Non - County Borough Councils	19	68	139
Urban District Councils - -	3	24	63
Total -	55	172	333

In addition, schemes not yet formally accepted by the Councils have been submitted for the consideration or observations of the Board, for three counties, four county boroughs, ten non-county boroughs, and three urban districts.

Aden—Condition of Barracks

Mr. ORR-EWING (Ayr Burghs): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state whether reports have been made during the last two years on the condition of the barracks and married quarters occupied by British troops at Aden; and if any steps will be taken in the near future to improve these buildings.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) It has been reported that the quarters occupied by the warrant and non-commissioned officers of the Ordnance Department at Aden are in an unsatisfactory condition, and I understand that the question of erecting new buildings is under the consideration of the Government of India. I am not aware that the other barracks and quarters occupied by British troops have been unfavourably reported upon.

Licensing in Scotland.

Mr. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, W.): To ask the Lord Advocate how many burghs in Scotland, of which the licensing authority at present is vested in the magistrates, will lose that privilege under the new Licensing Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I am informed that the number of burghs at present having licensing jurisdiction, and which it is proposed to merge in the county as having a population under 7,000, is 48.

Trawlers in the Moray Firth.

Mr. BIGNOLD (Wick Burghs): To ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that twenty British trawlers have recently fished the Moray Firth under the Norwegian flag, if he can say whether any, and, if so what, representations have been made to the Norwegian Government on the subject.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The question of making a representation to the Norwegian Government is under consideration, and I hope shortly to be in a position to state the decision which shall have been come to.

Imprisonment of a Seaman—Case of R. Moore.

Mr. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state the specific charges proved against R. Moore, of H.M.S. "Good Hope," who has been sentenced to imprisonment for ninety days with hard labour at Cape Town; and whether the Lords of the Admiralty can see their way to revise this sentence.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) Robert Moore was tried by court-martial at Arosa Bay, in Spain, on 19th February, and not at Cape Town. He pleaded guilty to having committed a breach of naval discipline in having published and sold on board the "Good Hope" a pamphlet containing criticisms on the conduct and organisation of that ship. On a review of the minutes of the court-martial the Board of Admiralty were of opinion that although Moore committed a serious breach of the regulations, there was an absence of malicious intent on his part, and, considering his former good character, the Board felt that they could properly exercise leniency in the case; they accordingly decided to remit the remainder of the imprisonment. The "Good Hope" having arrived at Portland, instructions were telegraphed that Moore was to be released.

H.M.S. "Good Hope —Speed and Coal Consumption.

Sir WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty when His Majesty's cruiser "Good Hope" left Cape Town, when she arrived at Las Palmas, how long she lay there, and when she left Las Palmas and for what port, and where she is at present; and will he say what was her average speed in knots from Cape Town to Las Palmas; and what number of tons of coal she took on board at both ports.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) H.M.S. "Good Hope" left Cape Town on the 24th January, and arrived at Las Palmas on the 10th February, having spent nearly three days (4th February, a.m., to 6th February, p.m.) at St. Vincent en route. She remained at Las Palmas until the 13th February when she left for Arosa Bay, arriving there on the 17th February and remaining till the 26th February. The "Good Hope" is at present with the Home Fleet at Portland. Her average speed from Cape Town to St. Vincent was fifteen knots, and from St. Vincent to Las Palmas ten and a half knots, or twelve and a half knots for the whole distance. The vessel did not coal at Cape Town or Las Palmas, but at Simonstown and St. Vincent. At the former port 1,606 tons of coal were taken on board, and at the latter 1,780 tons.

Tenders for the "Enchantress."

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will explain why shipbuilding firms on the Tyne, Wear, Humber, or the Thames were not asked to tender for His Majesty's new yacht "Enchantress"; and whether Messrs. Harland and Wolff have the contract on a lump sum or on the cost of labour, material, charges, and profit amounts.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The following firms were asked to tender for the Admiralty yacht, viz.:—Messrs. Barclay, Curle, Denny Brothers, Harland and Wolff, Henderson, Inglis, Laird Brothers, Ramage and Ferguson. The above firms were asked to tender because it was considered they were best able to deal with the requirements of the Admiralty in respect to the new yacht. Messrs. Harland and Wolff have undertaken the contract for a lump sum.

Navy—Promotions of Warrant Officers to Lieutenants.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, under the new Navy scheme, promotion of warrant officers to Lieutenant's rank will be by selection in all cases, and not by seniority; and whether it is proposed in such promotions to take the age of such Warrant Officers into consideration.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) It is proposed that the promotion of such officers to the rank of Lieutenant shall be by selection from the ranks of chief gunners, boatswains, carpenters, and chief engineer artificers when the latter are established, due regard being paid to seniority.

Navy — New Ration System — Date of coming into Operation.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can announce the date on which the new rations system for the Navy will come into operation.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The new scheme of rations has already been put into force for the boys' training ships. It is expected that arrangements will be made for the issue of rations on the new scheme for the whole of the Fleet at all stations throughout the world not later than the 1st October.

Braunton (North Devon) Lighthouse.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will explain the cause of the delay in commencing the work of connecting Braunton Lighthouse in North Devon with Braunton; and will he give orders to the effect that the connection, when made, shall be made both with the coast wire and the Braunton Post Office.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I explained in my reply to the hon. Member's Question in October last† that the Post Office authorities had no funds available for the purpose until the next financial year, which has not yet commenced. I am informed by the Post Office, with whom the matter rests, that it is proposed to connect the lighthouse with Braunton village, and that through that village there will be communication with the Coastguard Stations both north and south.

Irish Lights Board.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Government intend to introduce a measure to reconstitute the Irish Lights Board, with a view to increased efficiency; and whether the Government will assist a private Member's Bill in that direction.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I am not prepared to give any undertaking on this subject.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxiii., 795.

Ireland—Working Men as Justices of the Peace.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the names of a number of working men have been submitted to the Lord Chancellor, and to the Lord Lieutenants for the county boroughs of Dublin, Belfast, Cork, and Londonderry, from which a selection might be made for appointments to the commission of the peace for those boroughs respectively; and that in only one instance, on the recommendation of the Lord Mayor, a magistrate has been appointed from this list, namely, to the commission of the peace for the County Borough of Belfast; and whether, in view of the practice in England, he will represent to His Excellency and the Lord Chancellor the desirability of making appointments as justices of the peace from working men.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) It is altogether outside my province to intervene in the manner suggested. I would refer the hon. Member to my reply to the similar Question put to me on the 11th June last by the hon. Member for South Down.†

Loughrea (Galway) Loan Fund.

Mr. DUFFY (Galway, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the scheme in connection with the Loughrea (County Galway) Loan Fund has been considered by the Loan Fund Board; and, if so, will he say when it may be expected to come into operation.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The question of the establishment of a Loan Fund Society at Loughrea has not yet been determined by the Board. It is at present under the consideration of the Board's legal advisers.

Urban Districts (Ireland) Return.

Mr 'OSHEE (Waterford, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant the Return on the Paper relating to urban districts in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Yes, Sir; the Return will be granted†.

Housing of the Working Classes at Dublin.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the condition of affairs regarding the housing of the working classes in Kingstown and South Dublin; and whether the Government will consider the advisability of introducing this session a measure to amend the law affecting town tenants, inhabitant householders, and tenement occupiers in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The hon. Member has privately communicated with me in this matter. The Urban District Council of Kingstown has applied to the Local Government Board for power to take lands compulsorily under the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, and has also applied for two loans to enable it to carry out the schemes proposed. The Board has instructed its Inspector to hold a local inquiry in respect of these applications on the 16th instant. I cannot give any undertaking of the nature suggested in the second part of the Question.

Irish National Teachers—Repairs to Schools and Residences.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether an Irish national teacher, by the terms of his engagement, or the regulations of the Board, is obliged to carry out any, and, if so, what, repairs; and whether he is bound to carry out repairs rendered necessary by storm.

---

† See (4) *Debates,* cix., 365.

† The Return referred to is as follows:—Urban Districts (Ireland)—Return showing (1) the total rateable value of each of the Urban Districts in Ireland; (2) the borrowing powers of each, distinguishing between their powers under the Public Health (Ireland) Act and Local Acts (if any); (3) the amount borrowed by each Urban District on the security of the rates, distinguishing loans from (a) Local Loans Fund, (b) Stock, (c) other sources (exclusive of loans entirely repaid on the 1st day of January, 1902); (4) the amount of loans repaid up to the 1st day of January, 1902 (exclusive of loans entirely repaid on the 1st day of January, 1902); (5) the rate in the pound for all purposes levied in each Urban District during the years 1899, 1900, and 1901; and (6) the income (if any) of each Urban District from sources other than the rates.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) A distinction is drawn between school-houses and residences. Teachers are not bound to repair school-houses, but, under Rule 89 of the Rules and Regulations of the Commissioners, are expected to undertake at their own expense the repairs specified in that Rule in the cases of residences built by State aid. They are not required to undertake repairs rendered necessary by storm.

Irish Land Conference—Papers.

SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the event of his deciding to print and circulate with other Papers relating to Irish Land Purchase the Report of the Land Conference, he will also print and circulate the Resolution and Statement on Irish Land Purchase of the Landlords' Convention, dated 10th October, 1902.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Yes, Sir.

Irish National Schools—Assistant Teachers.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the interests of Irish education, he will consider the advisability of allowing assistant teachers in Irish national schools of high classification and long service, who are at present in the third grade after ten years' service, to enter the second grade.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Commissioners have reserved to themselves, by Rule 195 (f) of the Code, the power of promoting assistant teachers beyond the third grade under exceptional circumstances. It is not considered desirable to make a rule of the general character suggested.

Reservists in receipt of Reserve Pay.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state to the House the number of Reservists now actually in receipt of Reserve pay, and also the number of men not in receipt of the messing allowance.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The number of Reservists actually in receipt of Reserve pay on the 1st February was 38,823, there being 18,000 men on gratuity furlough at present on full pay who pass to the Reserve on the conclusion of their furlough. The number of men not in receipt of messing allowance depends on two conditions, viz., (a) whether they are under nineteen years of age; (b) whether they have performed six months satisfactory training. As regards (a) the number of men under nineteen on 1st February was 20,640. As regards (b) figures could only be obtained by applying to every unit.

Strength of the Army—Militia and Volunteer Staffs.

MR. HARMSWORTH: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Militia and Volunteer staffs are counted towards the strength of the battalions to which they are attached, and also towards the strength of the battalions to which they belong in the Regular Army; and also what is the total number of both staffs.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The permanent staff of the Militia and Volunteers are shown on the strength of the Militia and Volunteers respectively, and not on the strength of the Regular Army, except in the case of the officers of the Royal Engineers, who are shown on the strength of the Regular Army only. The total numbers, including all ranks, are: Militia, 4,211 (1st February); Volunteers, 1,983 (1st January).

Army—General Annual Return.

MR. HARMSWORTH: To ask the Seretary of State for War when he proposes to recommence the issuing of the General Annual Return of the British Army.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The Return will, it is hoped, be issued some time in April.

Soldiers' Club at Malta.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Soldiers Club at Malta has been revived; and whether suitable accommodation has been provided for it; and to what extent is the management in the hands of non-commissioned officers or privates?

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The question of providing for the Soldiers' Club at Malta has been under consideration, but, in view of other more urgent and more important requirements, it has not been found possible to allocate any sum from Army Estimates for the coming year for this purpose.

Affairs in Macedonia—Memoranda of Madame Bakhmetieff.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether steps have been taken by the Government to secure copies of the memoranda of Madame Bakhmetieff and of the information supplied to the Russian Government by M. Westman, the Russian Vice-Consul at Philippopolis, with reference to affairs in Macedonia; and, if so, will copies be circulated for the information fo Members of this House.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) It is not usual to apply to Foreign Governments for Reports of their agents for the purpose of publication here, nor is it desirable to present to Parliament reports which have appeared in foreign newspapers except in cases where they are quoted by our own agents as worthy of credence. Reference to Madame Bakhmetieff's mission will be found in Mr. Elliot's despatch of 12th December, on page 266 of the recent Blue-book (Turkey, No. 1, 1903).

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Army Corps Manœuvres.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will indicate the localities in which it is proposed that the Army Corps as units shall be manœuvred.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The manœuvre areas will vary in each year. This year general manœuvres in which the troops of the first two Army Corps will be mainly engaged will take place in Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Hampshire and Wiltshire.

Army Returns.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will grant the Returns in respect of Volunteers, Army Reserves, Military Works, and the Royal Garrison Regiments on to-day's Notice Paper.

*MR. BRODRICK: Yes, Sir; but I must point out that the Army Reserve Return shown on the Paper is not in accordance with that which I agreed to give my hon. friend.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: I had intended to amend it in accordance with the wishes of the right hon. Gentleman.

*MR. BRODRICK: If the hon. Gentleman will do that I will get the information for him.

British Campaigns and Expeditions.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will grant a Return showing the number of campaigns and expeditions during the last ten years, together with the number of troops employed, British or Native, in each campaign, and the respective cost of each.

*MR. BRODRICK: I have no objection to this Return.

Army Buildings on Salisbury Plain.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will place in the tea room a map of the War Department land, showing the buildings erected, in course of construction, or contemplated by the War Office.

*MR. BRODRICK: I presume the hon. Member means to confine his Question to Salisbury Plain. If so, a map can be given. To prepare such maps throughout England would be a serious labour.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: I thought I had included the words Salisbury Plain in my Question.

Officers' Expenses.

Mr. POWELL-WILLIAMS (Birmingham, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the reductions which have taken place in the necessary expenses of officers have been such as to enable officers in all branches of the service to meet such expenses without recourse to their private means; and, if not, by how much the pay of officers still falls short of the necessary outlay incident to the rank which they hold in the several branches of the service to which they belong.

*Mr. BRODRICK: The proposals connected with field kit, furniture, and the provision of chargers as laid down in Army Order 1 of 1903, will have the effect of considerably reducing the initial outlay for officers entering the Army. In the junior ranks, however, as in most other professions, it is not expected that it will be possible for officers to live entirely on their pay, although it is to be hoped that the amount of private means requisite for cavalry as well as for infantry will be reduced to very moderate sums.

Strength of the Army.

Colonel WELBY (Taunton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the effectives of all ranks estimated on page 12, Army Estimates, consist entirely of the fully trained fit to be sent on foreign or active service; and, if not, what proportion the fully trained bear to those unfit to be sent on service.

*Mr. BRODRICK: The figures alluded to represent the total strength on 1st February, 1903, as distinct from establishment. As my hon. and gallant friend is aware, the peace strength of our Army, like that of all others, contains a proportion of partially trained men who are replaced by Reservists on mobilisation. The proportion of fully trained to those unfit to be sent on service varies in different units, but out of battalions of 800 strength over 500 were on the average found fit for immediate mobilisation in the late war.

Colonel WELBY: Will the right hon. Gentleman arrange that another year only the numbers on the establishment shall be shown, and not the number effective. I think the figures given are misleading.

*Mr. BRODRICK: Oh, no, Sir; it is impossible to divide in any year establishment and strength. Whatever the strength is must be shown to Parliament for the purpose of information; the number of effectives, in the sense of fully trained men, varies from year to year.

Mr. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): Do I understand that 300 men out of every battalion are not effective?

*Mr. BRODRICK: No, Sir. The strength of battalions for mobilisation, which used to be 720, was only raised to 800 a year, or a year and a half, before the war began; but I believe, taking the battalions as full, that only 500 were found ready for mobilisation at the beginning of the war.

Mr. GOULDING (Wiltshire, Devizes): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, when he stated the strength of the Army to be 12,000 above strength, he included men on gratuity furlough: and whether such men are borne on the establishment of the regiments to which they belong.

*Mr. BRODRICK: No, Sir. The gratuity furlough men were not included. They are borne on the strength of their regiments until they go to the Reserve or are discharged; but they were excluded from the total strength in order not to give a wrong impression of the state of the forces.

Recruiting—How Numbers are Made up.

*Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War why a recruit who joins the Militia and leaves it to join the Army within the same year is counted as two recruits.

*Mr. BRODRICK: Recruits who join the Regular Army from the Militia are reckoned as recruits for the Militia when they join the Militia, and as recruits for the Regular forces when they join the Regular forces. If any impression is thereby produced that those who join the Regular Army are available for the Militia, it will be well to make a note in the Inspector General of Recruiting's Report to make this clear, and I will call his attention to it.

In answer to a Question by Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE—

MR. BRODRICK said that when a Militia recruit passed to the Regular Army, he was taken off the strength of the Militia and added to that of the Army.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Lord Roberts and Lord Belhaven.

* MR. BRODRICK: A statement which I made on behalf of the Commander-in-Chief on Thursday last has been challenged; and, therefore, I must trouble the House for one moment with a personal explanation. Lord Belhaven has complained, by a letter in the Press, that he was misrepresented by the statement that he called upon Lord Roberts with Lord de Saumarez and made complaints as to certain practices in the Grenadier Guards. Lord Roberts desires me to say that what occurred was as follows:—Lord de Saumarez called on him on 12th December, and called his attention to a series of incidents affecting his relative and other young officers. On completing his statement he asked Lord Roberts to see Lord Belhaven, who had come with him, and who was waiting in the next room in Lord Roberts' house. Lord Roberts asked Lord Belhaven if the practices complained of in the regiment, and the caning of Lord Belhaven's son, were true within his knowledge, and Lord Belhaven corroborated Lord de Saumarez on these points, making a reservation that he did not wish to complain about his son's ill-treatment, as he had accepted Colonel Kinloch's word of honour as to his ignorance of the proceeding, though he (Lord Belhaven) had told Colonel Kinloch, in accepting this statement, that appearances were much against him. Lord Roberts told Lord de Saumarez and Lord Belhaven he should take the matter up officially, and proceeded to do so. Under these circumstances Lord Roberts could only inform me that these statements were brought before him by the two gentlemen named, and he was much astonished at Lord Belhaven's disclaimer in the Press of 7th instant.

Field Artillery Batteries at Limerick.

MR. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, if the 68th and 126th Batteries of Royal Field Artillery, now stationed at Limerick, are in possession of their full complement of guns and horses; and, if not, what is the extent of the deficiency with regard to their equipment in these details.

MR. BRODRICK: Both batteries have their full complement of guns. The 68th Battery has thirty-six horses and the remaining thirty required will be supplied as soon as possible; the supply of horses has been delayed through their being in quarantine after veterinary treatment. The 126th Battery has sixty-three out of the sixty-six horses necessary.

Portsmouth Harbour.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, are the Admiralty aware that the London and South-Western Railway Company proposes to substitute for the existing swing bridge a permanent bridge across the channel leading from the head of Portsmouth Harbour round Portsea Island to the sea at Langston Harbour; would such a permanent bridge wholly prevent this channel from being used by torpedo boat destroyers, and thus close the alternative entrance to Portsmouth Harbour; does the Admiralty propose, either by remonstrance with the Company or by opposition to any Bill it may introduce for authorising the alteration, or otherwise, to procure the abandonment of the proposal; if not, what steps do they propose to take.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The Admiralty have sanctioned the construction of a permanent bridge over the Hilsea Channel after full consideration of the proposal in all its aspects, including, of course, that to which the hon. Member's Question relates. The Admiralty do not, therefore, intend to take any steps in opposition to the project.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: The hon. Gentleman says full consideration was given to this matter. Did the Admiralty consult the Admiral Commanding at Portsmouth?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes, Sir.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: And did he approve of it?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! This is not the time to raise that question.

Boer Prisoners in India.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India why have Boer prisoners of war in India been put to hard labour, subjected to the cropping of the hair, and placed on bread and water for declining to do menial work on the ground that they were prisoners of war and not criminals.

THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR INDIA (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): All prisoners of war are subject to the regulations in force amongst the troops in whose custody they are kept, and if they decline to obey them or misconduct themselves they are subject to the military penalties attached to such offences.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Can the noble Lord state without notice how many Boers have been subjected to these penalties?

EARL PERCY: No, Sir, I cannot.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state what arrangements have been made with reference to the Boer prisoners of war in India who refuse to take the oath of allegiance but are willing to sign the conditions of peace; and how many Boer prisoners of war are at present in India under these circumstances.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E., for Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN): No distinction is drawn between the taking of the oath of allegiance by prisoners of war and the signing of the declaration of acceptance of the terms of surrender. There are now about 800 prisoners of war in India who have refused either to take the oath or make the declaration, and it has been arranged that General Botha shall send a messenger to them to explain to them the desirability of making the declaration.

Transvaal Mines—Employment of Natives.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): I beg to ask the Postmaster General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, what the statistics of mortality, sickness, and desertion are per thousand of the natives employed in the Transvaal mines during the last six months.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (for Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN): The Governor will be asked to furnish the statistics asked for by the hon. Member, and they will be communicated to him when received.

China—British Railway Concessions.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, with reference to the summary of railway concessions in China up to the end of November 1898 laid before Parliament as an Appendix to a letter from Sir Claude MacDonald, printed in China, No. 1, 1899, in which 2,800 miles of British railway concessions were shown as against a smaller amount for each of the other Powers, will he state what number of miles of such British concessions is now existent; what British railways are now being actually made; and what action the Government are taking in the matter.

THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): With the exception of the Hankow-Canton line, in which the British and Chinese Corporation are no longer interested, the remaining British railway concessions enumerated by Sir Claude MacDonald (about 2,500 miles in all) are still existent, but only the Peking-Newchwang line with its extension from Peking to Tungchow (about 600 miles), is open to traffic. The branch from Chunghow-so to Sinminting is approaching completion. The Peking Syndicate's line from Taokou to the Honan coalfields is in course of construction, and their line to Pukou is under negotiation. Surveys have been made for the lines from Soochow to Hangchow and Ningpo, and from Canton to Kowloon. The British and Chinese Corporation have just concluded a fresh agreement for the construction of the line from Shanghai to Nanking. I informed the House on the 4th instant† of the action taken by His Majesty's Government in regard to the Pukou line; with regard to the other lines, no action, so far as His Majesty's Government are aware, is desired by the concessionaires.

China—Wuchang Viceroy.

MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W. R., Barnsley): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the present feeling towards foreigners in China, and in recognition of the preservation of the life and property of foreigners during the Boxer rising by Chang-Chih-Tung, the influence of His Majesty's Government will be used to secure his reinstatement as Viceroy at Wuchang.

LORD CRANBORNE: His Majesty's Government have already placed upon record their appreciation of the efforts made by the Viceroy Chang for the preservation of the life and property of foreigners during the late troubles. According to information recently received from His Majesty's *Chargé d'Affaires* at Peking, His Excellency has memorialised the Throne for permission to proceed to Peking as a preliminary to his reinstatement at Wuchang. We have no reason to suppose that his return will be refused.

St. Louis Exposition.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can now supplement his answer of the 18th December last† by stating what arrangements have been made for British and Irish commercial displays at the coming St. Louis Exposition; and whether a Royal Commission will be appointed in connection therewith.

LORD CRANBORNE: I am not yet able to give definite information to the House. Arrangements are in course of being made, and gentlemen have been asked to serve upon the body which is to represent this country, but its composition, the question of its title, and the sum to be granted, cannot be finally decided until we have more information as to the support we may expect from those interested in commerce. Perhaps the hon. Member will put another Question later on.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: I will put a further Question next Monday.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Have any Irishmen been invited?

LORD CRANBORNE: I must ask for notice of the Question.

SIR A. ROLLIT (Islington, S.): Have communications been opened with chambers of commerce on the subject?

LORD CRANBORNE: I must ask for notice also, I am afraid.

British and Russian Influence in Persia.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government have been or are in communication with the Governments of Russia and Persia with a view of establishing a definite amicable understanding as to the action and influence of Great Britain and Russia in Persia; whether any analogous communications have taken place with the Russian Government relative to Afghanistan; and whether Papers relative to either of these two subjects can be laid upon the Table of the House.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxviii., 1348.

† See (4) *Debates*, cxvi., 1637.

LORD CRANBORNE: It would, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, be most desirable that there should be an amicable understanding between Great Britain and Russia in regard to their respective interests in Persia and elsewhere. Questions involving those interests have lately been under discussion between the two Governments. There are no Papers which can be laid before the House.

Chinese Anti-Foreign Feeling.

MR. C. E. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has received any official reports from Tientsin and Manchuria as to the Boxer movement and anti-foreign feeling in China; and will he state what measures the Government are taking in the matter.

LORD CRANBORNE: No information has been received from Manchuria, but His Majesty's Consul General at Hankow has reported that he had received trustworthy information of a threatened movement in Kansu. A report from the British Vice Consul at Tientsin also pointed in the same direction. His Majesty's *Chargé d'Affaires* has warned the Chinese Government, and the Wai-pu-wu have stated in reply that they have received no corroboration of the news, and that the reports have probably arisen from movements of disbanded troops in Kansu.

Argentine Finance—Consular Report.

MR. ROSE (Cambridgeshire, Newmarket): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can explain the delay in the issue of the Consular Report on the Finances of the Argentine Republic which has just been issued, but which was received by the Foreign Office in the middle of December; and whether he can arrange for the issue of similar Consular Reports with less delay in future.

LORD CRANBORNE: The delay was due to the Report having been referred to the author for revision. He was expected to return to England at the beginning of the year but his coming was unavoidably postponed.

Scotch Whisky.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that English spirit, made mainly from molasses, is used in blending and bottling operations, for home consumption, in Excise or Customs warehouses in Scotland; that operations of this kind are carried on in Government warehouses and under the supervison of Revenue officials; and will he say whether spirit made from molasses is permitted to be described and sold as Scotch whisky, either separately or blended.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): English spirit made mainly from molasses is not distinguished in the Revenue accounts from spirit manufactured from other materials, and there is nothing to prevent its being used in blending and bottling operations for home consumption in Excise or Customs warehouses in Scotland. The Revenue authorities have no means of knowing how spirits in casks, whether made from molasses or not, is described and sold by the vendor; and they do not interfere with labels or names used on bottles or cases filled or made up in bond, beyond seeing that no label or inscription is used implying official countenance or guarantee of the correctness of the statements made.

MR. MACVEAGH: Do I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say it is not possible for the Excise to discover whether this "Scotch" whisky is manufactured from molasses and yet sold as Scotch?

MR. RITCHIE: The Excise have no power to ask as to what the spirit is made of, or to penalise any particular product.

MR. MACVEAGH: Will the right hon. Gentleman cause inquiry to be made as to the constituents of Scotch whisky?

[No answer was given.]

Death Duties on Licensed Properties.

Sir W. HART DYKE (Kent, Dartford): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that death duties have been charged and paid upon licensed property valued at from nineteen to twenty-five years' purchase upon the gross estimated rental, and that a few weeks afterwards notice has been given to surrender some of the very licences upon which the said duty had just been charged; and whether he can suggest any remedy for such a state of affairs.

Mr. RITCHIE: The Estate Duty Office has no knowledge of any such cases as the right hon. Member refers to. But, if he will furnish particulars, inquiry shall be made.

Brussels Sugar Convention—Views of British Colonies and India.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade have His Majesty's Government, in fulfilment of their obligation under the Brussels Sugar Convention signed 5th March, 1902, submitted that Convention to the self-governing colonies and to the East Indies, so that they may have an opportunity of giving their adhesion to it; if so, to which of the self-governing colonies has it been so submitted, and what reply has been received in each case; and will His Majesty's Government lay these replies upon the Table.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): I am informed by the India Office and the Colonial Office, which are the two Departments immediately concerned, that the Convention has been duly submitted to the Governments of India and the self-governing colonies, that a reply has been received from the Commonwealth of Australia briefly stating that they do not desire to adhere to the Convention, and that the remaining self-governing colonies and the Government of India have not as yet signified their wishes in the matter. When the correspondence on the subject is complete, I have no doubt my right hon. friends the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the Secretary of State for India will consider whether any, and, if so, what Papers on the subject should be laid upon the Table.

Manchester Post Office—Head Postmen.

Mr. C. E. SCHWANN: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether, in view of the dissatisfaction caused amongst the staff of the Manchester Post Office by the recent promotions of allowance holders to the head postmen's class, thereby passing the allowance holders over the heads of seniors in the service, he will take care that the same system be not employed in the mode of selection of any new appointments about to be filled there.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I can only refer the hon. Member to the answer which I gave to his Question on the 25th ultimo, and to which I have nothing to add.†

Alien Criminals.

Mr. POWELL-WILLIAMS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will add to the Return in preparation relating to alien prisoners now undergoing punishment, a statement showing approximately the total cost to the country of carrying out the sentences passed upon them.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): Yes, Sir; the Return which I have promised of aliens in prison at a given date will contain an approximate calculation of the cost entailed by the detention of these persons.

London and Globe Finance Corporation.

Mr. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether evidence has been laid before him that a shareholder of the London and Globe Finance Corporation, after the publication of the balance-sheet of 5th December, 1900, bought further shares, believing such balance-sheet to be true; and, if so, will he reconsider his decision not to prosecute the directors.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxviii., 803.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): The only evidence to this effect was that one person bought some shares at the price of 2s. 10½d. after the company had gone into liquidation. Having regard to the date of the purchase and the amount paid, this fact did not appear to me to be one which should affect my judgment.

Scottish Licensing Law.

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he proposes to bring in a Bill to consolidate the existing licensing law of Scotland; and, if so, what course he intends to pursue in regard to it.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): It is the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill to consolidate the existing licensing law of Scotland, and the course of procedure with regard to the Bill is still under consideration.

Customs Boatmen's Grievances.

MR. HARRY SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, whether, in view of the Report of the Committee appointed last year to inquire into the alleged grievances of the Customs boatmen, he can now state whether he can make any, and, if so, what, improvements in the present system and in the status of the men employed.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (MR. HAYES FISHER, Fulham): Yes, Sir. The Board of Customs have submitted proposals to the Treasury which will effect a marked improvement in the position of the boatmen. These proposals I have decided to sanction practically as formulated. They include an addition to the staff of one Chief Preventive Officer and thirty Preventive Officers, Upper Section: a reduction of eight in the Preventive Officers, Lower Section, and a reduction of 133 in the number of established boatmen, and sixteen in the number of watchers. These alterations involve a considerable increase in the proportion of the higher to the lower classes. They will also facilitate the general adoption (so far as possible) of the eight hours day. In addition, a system of star allowances (equivalent to good conduct stripes) will be introduced, the allowances now given for rerummaging being abolished. Each "star" will carry with it an extra allowance of £2 10s. per annum. A boatman will be eligible for one star after ten years service, for two stars after fifteen years service, and for three stars after twenty years service. Thus the possible maximum of his scale will be increased by £7 10s. Additional benefits will be conferred upon other portions of the Waterguard Service which I need not specify at present.

The House will be glad to learn that the cost of these concessions will be counterbalanced by economies resulting from improved methods of rummaging ships. A general order containing a formal announcement of the alterations will shortly be issued by the Board of Customs.

Seed Potatoes for Ireland.

MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will publish the particulars of the names and quantities of seed potatoes required by the Department of Agriculture for Ireland, and take steps to bring these particulars before English growers, so that they may have an opportunity of tendering for the supply.

*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The Department is not purchasing seed potatoes for demonstration plots this year.

Inspection of Irish Intermediate Schools.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will explain why this year three only of the six temporary inspectors employed during last year have been appointed to do the work in connection with the inspection of intermediate schools in Ireland; and will he say what steps it is proposed to take to place the inspection of the intermediate schools in Ireland upon a permanent basis.

*Mr. WYNDHAM: Only three of the gentlemen employed last year are available this year. A fourth temporary inspector, not so employed, has recently been appointed. The Board is considering the appointment of two others. The whole question of inspection is engaging the attention of the Government.

Swinford Seed Loan.

Mr. O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he has received from the Swinford District Council a statement dealing with a claim of the Commissioners of Works in connection with interest on a loan under the Seed Supply and Potato Spraying (Ireland) Act, 1898; and, if so, whether, in view of the circumstances of this case, he can see his way to cancel the claim altogether.

*Mr. WYNDHAM: The statement in question has been received, and is at present under consideration.

Irish School Teachers—New Rules and Salaries.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to a petition from ninety-five teachers and their managers, asking for an inquiry into the manner in which salaries were fixed under the New Rules; and whether, in view of the assurances given officially in the House that no teacher would suffer financially by the changes that were being made, the inquiry which has been asked for will be granted.

*Mr. WYNDHAM: Representations have been made by a number of teachers complaining that their salaries had not been fixed on an equitable basis. In all such cases careful inquiry has been made by the Commissioners, and the salaries revised whenever it was deemed fair and right to do so. As against these representations I would refer the hon. Member to the Report of the Controller and Auditor General at page 407 of the Appropriation Accounts for the year 1901–1902, just issued, in which he draws attention to test audits of the correctness of the consolidated salaries awarded to teachers, as a result of which it was ascertained that a number of teachers were paid salaries in *excess* of what they ought to have been paid. The existing machinery has proved adequate to deal with all cases of the kind mentioned, and I see no sufficient reason for holding a special inquiry in the matter.

Land Purchase in Leitrim—Gillmor's Case.

Mr. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the extent in statute measure of the holding purchased under the terms of an agreement, dated 24th July, 1902, by Mr. Stuart Gillmor, merchant, of Dromahair, county Leitrim, for the purchase of which a sum of £480 was advanced by the Land Commission, and the terms upon which this advance was made.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Thirteen acres, one rood, twenty-eight perches. The advance was made for the purchase of the fee-simple of the holding.

Roxboro Road Schools, Limerick.

*Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that the Roxboro Road Schools have been in the occupation of the Rev. Dean Gregg from the year 1880 to the present time at a yearly rent of £20, with a covenant on his part to keep them in repair, will he state in what year did the rents begin to accumulate in the hands of the Commissioners, and the amount of these accumulations previous to the inquiry by the Education Endowments Commission; and if there were none, can he say what became of the rents and who is responsible for them.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Under the agreement made with Dean Gregg he is bound to keep the school premises in good repair, and to yield up the same in as good condition and repair as he received them, reasonable wear and tear excepted. There were various accumulations from time to time between 1880 and 1891, resulting from excess of income over expenditure. The total expenditure in that period by the Commissioners on repairs was £198. During the same period Dean Gregg expended on the premises out of his own money over £160. In October, 1887, when the inquiry was held by the Commissioners, the net balance in their hands was £45.

Buncrana and Cardonagh Railway.

MR. M'FADDEN (Donegal, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if arbitrators were appointed by the Board, as required by Section 6 of the Tramways (Ireland) Act, 1883, in connection with the Buncrana to Carndonagh Railway, County Donegal; can he say whether the arbitrators certified any sum payable on foot of the guarantee sanctioned by the Grand Jury of the county prior to the commencement of the construction of the railway; and, if so, what was the amount certified to be due and payable by the Donegal County Council on foot of the guarantee.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The answer to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative. I have no official information on the further points raised, as certificates issued by arbitrators under the provisions referred to are not furnished to the Board of Trade, whose functions in the matter do not extend beyond the appointment of the arbitrators.

Limerick Postal and Telegraph Staffs' Grievances.

*MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he will explain why irregularities committed by the postal and telegraph staffs at Limerick are recorded and taken into consideration in connection with the granting of annual increments, seeing that such irregularities are disregarded at Dublin, Cork, Belfast, and other large offices.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have no reason to believe that there is any such variation in practice as the hon. Member describes. No increment can be granted to any officer without a certificate that his conduct in the preceding twelve months has been approved.

Limerick Post Office—Assistant Superintendentship.

*MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether it is his intention to promote a local official to the assistant superintendentship now vacant at Limerick Post Office; and, if not, will he assign the reason.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No recommendation for filling the vacancy has yet been made, but the claims and qualifications of the officers in Limerick will receive my careful consideration.

*MR. JOYCE: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the duties of this office have not been performed in the most satisfactory manner by a local officer during the absence of the assistant superintendent, and will he give this matter due consideration, as every class of the community would be pleased at such an appointment.

The Budget.

SIR GEORGE BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he can give the House any information as to when the Budget will be introduced.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I am afraid it would be premature to make any statement on the subject.

NEW BILLS.

BANKRUPTCY ACT (1883) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend The Bankruptcy Act, 1883," presented by Mr. Brynmor Jones; supported by Mr. M'Kenna, Mr. Price, and Mr. Harry Samuel; to be read a second time upon Friday, 24th April, and to be printed. [Bill 86.]

FOREIGNERS' MARRIAGES BILL.

"For the better safeguarding of British subjects in their intermarriage with Foreigners," presented by Mr. Macdona; supported by Mr. Talbot, Mr. Rothschild, Sir Joseph Dimsdale, Mr. Churchill, Lord Hugh Cecil, Captain Norton, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Samuel Evans, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Stuart Samuel, and Mr. Heywood Johnstone; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 87.]

POOR LAW SUPERANNUATION (IRELAND) BILL.

"To provide for Superannuation allowances to certain local officers and servants in Ireland, for contributions towards such allowances by such officers and servants, and to make other relative provisions," presented by Mr. Joyce; supported by Sir James Haslett, Mr. O'Malley, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Cogan, and Mr. T. W. Russell; to be read a second time upon Monday 23rd March, and to be printed. [Bill 88.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FRANCHISE AND REPRESENTATION (EXTENSION TO COMPANIES) BILL.

"For extending Local Government Franchises and Representation to certain Corporations and to Joint Stock and other Companies," presented by Sir Albert Rollit; supported by Sir Fortescue Flannery, Mr. H. C. Richards, Sir William Holland, and Mr. Howard; to be read a second time upon Friday, and to be printed. [Bill 89.]

SUPPLY (ARMY ESTIMATES).

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

*COLONEL LONG (Worcestershire, Evesham): This Resolution, Sir, raises a question which, I believe, is equal in importance to any, even of the greatest factors which have to be considered in the formation of an efficient Army. There may be the most perfect organisation—on paper; there may be a considerable supply of excellent recruits of a good quality; yet, if the officers and men are not trained in accordance with the requirements of modern war, no army will be able to cope with an opponent so trained, and only after a course of both dangerous and disastrous education in the field will such an army become efficient. Last year we had the Report of a Committee on the training of officers, and a most grave and serious condition of affairs was shown to have existed in the past, and, possibly, even to exist in the present. Many distinguished officers of the highest rank—some of whom, at all events, had been in a position to bring influence to bear on the problem—were unanimous in stating that the junior officers were lamentably wanting in military knowledge, and in the desire to acquire that knowledge, and they added that keenness was out of fashion. It does not seem to have occurred to these distinguished officers that it was the duty of the senior officers to see that those under them were trained to understand and to perform those duties on active service which are the very object of their existence as officers. For, if it was not for the certainty of war from time to time there would be no necessity for an Army at all, and if they themselves had been keen, in all human probability the young officers, too, would have been keen.

Many of the witnesses urged that there were not sufficient inducements to study; that there was no certainty of more rapid promotion as the result. No doubt hope of advancement provides a great stimulant to work, and ought to be a powerful instrument in the hands of the authorities for obtaining efficiency. But would any private business firm content themselves with keeping hands who did not only not improve, but who were evidently inefficient for the work they were kept to do? Does not a heavy responsibility rest on the officers in command of battalions, etc., to see that junior officers are steadily advancing towards what will mean efficiency in time of war? Does not an equal responsibility rest on generals to see that commanding officers of units under their command clearly recognise and really act up to their responsibility? And, lastly, does not great responsibility rest also with those officers who are in the highest position of our Army administration, to see that the generals holding command make themselves acquainted with the condition of the forces in their charge, and do not hesitate to use the powers committed to them? Very considerable those powers are; no less than the power, after due report and examination, of checking temporarily or terminating permanently the career, as officers, of those under them. It has always seemed to me that, given three steps in the chain of command and responsibility—say, for argument, those of general, colonel, and captain—if the general finds that the captain is inefficient or faulty, it is the colonel that should be blamed, and even, if necessary, forfeit his position. He should either have made his subordinate efficient or reported that he was hopeless; then long ago the system would have been changed and amended. This is the ordinary chain of responsibility which, from various causes, has in the past become so rusty that nothing short of the grossest inefficiency — discovered, perhaps, by accident—or bad discipline, or personal misconduct, has caused strong measures to be taken.

I noticed in the evidence given before the Education Committee, a distinguished officer holding a position of influence second perhaps only to that of the Commander-in-Chief, and directly responsible for the training of the Army, stated that under the existing system there was no possibility of the young officers studying, and it was absolutely impossible to find the time for military training. I think this was somewhat of an exaggeration, and that many young officers and senior officers have trained themselves, but he went on to mention that he had been writing much—multiplying paper—for a year or two on the subject, and had tired out two successive Secretaries of State for War. When I read this evidence last year, I could not help thinking that these masses of paper represented a defensive work thrown up by a skilled tactician to protect himself from any objectionable attack which might arise from the report of such a Committee as this on the training of officers. And I could not help thinking also that if he had adopted offensive tactics, such as are said to have been taken by certain gallant sailors when, in despair at the condition of our Navy, they said they would resign their appointments if steps were not taken to remedy the dangerous condition of affairs, he would not, as he tells us in his evidence, have had to spend six years in working at, and two years in writing about, the subject. Is it not possible that this and similar things are what the late Chancellor of the Exchequer meant when he said at Bristol that reforms were wanted as much on the military side as on the civil side of the War Office? I do not say that the paper efforts of the distinguished officer were altogether wasted, because probably they had something to do with the present Secretary of State for War appointing the Committee on Training.

Whatever may be thought of the military scheme of the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the War Office, and the amount of his Estimates, I think every one will agree that he has always been prepared to take the initiative, and he has not feared to face responsibility. I should like to ask what steps he is going to take to enforce a sound chain of responsibility. There may be a Director-General of training, a perfect course of instruction in drill books and regulations, and even in practical work, but it will be useless if it is not brought home to all that they are responsible for the efficiency of those below them, and that their own professional career will suffer if they do not fully recognise that responsibility, even though they may have left the position in which they made the recommendation which proved to be wrong. And this is very important. When an officer gets command of a battalion of infantry, say, which is in bad order, he knows very well that if he takes strong measures it will not only make him unpopular but it may injure his military career. For when the battalion was rotten things may have been quiet and smooth, but the path of peform, as the right hon. Gentleman knows, is troublesome and stormy, and he is inclined to "let sleeping dogs lie." But whoever finds himself in that position, as I did once, should feel that he is between Scylla and Charybdis, and should realise that if he will not take the trouble at once it may fall on him at a less opportune moment.

Now, Sir, one of the great lessons of modern war is that now, more than ever, presence of mind—the power to rapidly sum up the conditions of a moment as they affect a general plan, and to follow up by prompt initiative and a fearless taking of responsibility — are the qualities which make an efficient officer. They are qualities long recognised as necessary in anyone aspiring to be a leader of cavalry or a great general. They are now as necessary in every officer, non-commissioned officer and man; and in future the first object of military training must be to develop those qualities. No doubt some men possess these to a greater degree than others, but they can be developed by training in almost every one, by cultivating powers of observation and insuring a thorough knowledge of principles, with plenty of practice in applying those principles under constantly changing circumstances. The opportunities for such practice, however, have not existed as much as might be wished under the existing system. Even in barracks and in the barrack square, even in the everyday life of a regiment in quarters, habits of taking responsibility, knowledge of the art of how to gain influence over men, and so to lead them, and the knowledge of that theory which must precede practice can be obtained. But the practice necessary, before men will have confidence in themselves and use their powers boldly and confidentially in war time, can only be obtained under conditions somewhat resembling actual warfare.

In England in the past there have been various units, infantry, cavalry, and artillery, scattered about the country in isolated barracks. In many cases regiments have been broken up into small detachments, and other regiments have been so largely composed of recruits that it has been impossible to get sufficiently trained men on parade, after providing for the innumerable garrison and regimental employments, to give effective instruction to either officers or men. In answer to a question just now, the right hon. Gentleman mentioned that the battalions which went out to South Africa had 500 men ready to go, but one knows that when you come to details 500 dwindle down to a very small number on parade. The lack of sufficient trained soldiers in home battalions for the training and practice of officers, and the unavoidable absorption of all their time in elementary instruction of recruits arises entirely from our system of linked battalions. There was once an ancient people, we are told, whom a tyrant commanded to make bricks, and while he gave them straw they did make bricks; when he gave no straw they made very bad bricks. That has been the condition of the British Army in the past. They had to make practical officers, but in England they had no men to practise with, and, in many cases, no ground to practise on. That is the secret of many regrettable incidents in South Africa; that is the only excuse—I do not know if it is altogether a valid excuse—of commanding officers having allowed men to be promoted who were not thoroughly trained, and the only excuse, a somewhat feeble one, why officers in high positions have failed to bring home by strong measures to commanding officers their individual responsibility when a man under them is promoted.

It may be said that promotion in the junior ranks has always gone by seniority; this is not absolutely the case, in theory at all events; promotion has been by seniority tempered by rejection. The power to reject has been too much forgotten and neglected. The Secretary of State for War has been endeavouring to supply some straw, for he is enlarging the powers of generals in the matter of training, but what advice and counsel on these matters does he receive from his military experts? How does he propose to apply it so that in battalions full of recruits, officers may constantly apply practically the theories they have acquired by study? I do not say anything specially about the training of the men, because I believe in training the officers thoroughly. You will, given time and opportunity, train the men also; but now that there are so many three-year men, I should like to suggest that although we must keep up to the full every hour of our gymnasium drill, still a great deal of what I may call the ornamental recruit drill should be done away with. We have not the time or money to expend on it. I think that men should be put as soon as possible direct to their musketry course, and their field course, believing as I do that by that means you will have immediately many more men on whom you can reckon. The training of the officers of the auxiliary forces presents some different factors. The Secretary of State for War, in abolishing the Militia Army Reserve, and starting a Militia Reserve, has probably done more for our Militia service than any modern War Minister, for he has prevented their being robbed of all their best men in time of war, and opened out new avenues of hope and ambition to the senior officers of that service. But though many Militia and Volunteer officers have attained high efficiency under the old system, and have proved their worth during the late war, there must be very considerable advance in the training of the auxiliary force officers, if these forces are to be raised to the fullest efficiency of which they are capable. It is a difficult question, and it is necessary to keep always in mind that these officers are not like those in the Regular forces, giving up their whole time to the service, and any scheme to be effectual, and to attract the best men, must work side by side with their ordinary life and professions.

Probably it will be necessary to give to the officers themselves considerable choice of time and method for obtaining the necessary experience and knowledge, and to judge of their fitness for promotion by the reports of those who instructed them, supplemented by a good practical test, and examination just before promotion. This is a question which, if the Secretary of State can solve it satisfactorily, will go far to make our Militia and Volunteers thoroughly effective in their respective positions. I believe myself in that way it is one of the keys to future economy in military expenditure, because if our Militia and Yeomanry attain to real efficiency, it will be possible to do what I believe could not be safely done now, look to them for a portion of that "striking force" which the nation must possess over and above its naval supremacy if it is to be able to support and protect its commercial interests by means of diplomacy. Many allusions have been made lately to the able letter in *The Times*, but the public seem to have forgotten the first letter, in which the writer drew attention to the fact that we had a strategical frontier, and drew a line through South Africa, Persia, India and China, pointing out that that was our strategic boundary in those parts. The sea was the base, and when you remembered that no army, no nation, is successful which keeps on the defensive, you will have to reckon that some time or other you may have to push a striking force inland from that line. I can quite understand persons at the Court of Pekin or Persia, for instance, saying "We do not care about Great Britain; we have no Navy they can take away from us, and they have no Army they can bring against us." I beg to move.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): In rising to second the Motion of my hon. and gallant friend, I will endeavour to be as brief as possible. My hon. and gallant friend has referred to the recent Report of the Military Education Committee, and having been a member of that Committee, I think I am entitled to ask the Secretary of State for War to state what he intends to do to remedy the defects in the training of officers and men which were disclosed in the Report of that Committee. The Committee dealt with three main subjects. First, the antecedent general education of the Army candidates; second, the training in the military colleges and universities, and thirdly, with the question of training of officers, after joining the Army, and consequently with the training of the men under them. So far as we can ascertain, the Secretary of State has done nothing whatever with regard to the recommendations under the first head; under the second he has taken partial, and, so far as it goes, satisfactory action with regard to the military colleges, and, so far as the third series of recommendations is concerned, he has taken no action at all. I have no doubt the right hon. Gentleman will plead lack of time, but he has had this Report in his hands for a full year, and I think it is time either to accept or repudiate the recommendations of the Committee. What does this Report say? My hon. and gallant friend who moved the Motion has drawn attention to one or two of the more salient recommendations in that Report. I would call the right hon. Gentleman's attention to this—

> "Several causes appear to have combined to bring about this state of things, the gravity of which cannot be exaggerated. From the evidence laid before them, the Committee are driven to conclude that the dominant cause is that the promotion of the young officer is not dependent on the zeal and ability which he may show. . . .'
>
> "Under the existing system the promotion of indolent officers is as rapid as—and may be more rapid than—that of their more industrious

comrades, a fact which is a sufficient explanation of the lack of zeal of which so many witnesses complain. Such was the evidence, not only of the majority of witnesses examined before the Committee, but also eighty-seven commanding officers 'who were consulted, and whose opinions tend to show that' the professional advancement of the officer depends on many considerations quite apart from his professional merit or military capacity."

That is a very serious indictment, but the Report goes further and shows that not only have the officers of the Army very little inducement to study their profession seriously, but that the War Office has no means of ascertaining whether an officer is efficient or not. All they do is to impose certain ridiculous, perfunctory, and entirely theoretical tests upon him as to his knowledge. The present promotion examinations, of which there are only four during the whole of an officer's career, from Second Lieutenant to Field-Marshal, are wholly illusory and useless to a degree which can only be realised by those who, like myself, have had to go through them, or by those who have studied the Report of the Military Education Committee. I will not weary the House with a description of these examinations, but the Committee dissected them exhaustively and summed up the tests as follows. Of the first examination the Committee said—

> "The futility of the examination in A and B is notorious."

Of the second examination they say—

> With regard to the examination in C, D, and G, the Committee are of opinion that theory is unduly exalted at the expense of practice, it being to a large extent a mere paper examination, and a test not of the candidate's real ability, but of his power to commit to memory and reproduce on paper facts from the text-books. In this respect there has been an actual retrogression in the last few years."

Then they conclude their Report with this statement—

> "It is useless to expect a spirit of keenness for self-improvement in professional subjects if promotion be accorded to the slothful and unintelligent, if the diligent and quick-witted find that they gain nothing by those qualities, but are liable to be left behind in the race by those having the good fortune to possess connections and interest.
>
> "The Committee wish most emphatically to repeat that the only chance of a general improvement in military education—and in the consequent efficiency of the Army—lies in an honest system of promotion by merit, following upon tests conducted in an honest and practical manner, honestly reported on, and duly acted upon by the authorities."

Well, Sir, I should like to know what the right hon. Gentleman is going to do about these promotion examinations; which, after all, form the only control at present exercised over the efficiency and the training of the officers of the Army?

So much with regard to the training of the individual officer in his theoretical duties; now as regards his practical duties. It is an obvious truism, I think, that the only way in which an officer can become acquainted with his practical duties is by continual practice in the field—of course, I do not necessarily mean the field of battle—and by the actual handling of the troops whom he will have to command in time of war. It cannot be done by the mere reading of text books, by passing paper examinations, or by looking at a "War Game." What is absolutely necessary is continual practice with the section, company, regiment, or Army Corps, which he would have to command in actual warfare: that, and that alone, can fit him for the real business of war. And yet what does the late Adjutant General of the Army, the present Commander of the Second Army Corps, say about the present system? He says—and it is a striking statement to come from an officer in his responsible position:—

> "The present system renders military training 'absolutely impossible,' and also prevents the proper training of officers, non-commissioned officers and men. In these statements he is supported by the majority of military witnesses, who state that there is no continuity of instruction in the battalion, and that regimental training is necessarily defective and interrupted. Under the existing system the officer rarely sees the men for whose military efficiency he is supposed to be responsible. They are largely employed in non-military duties, such as waiting in the canteens and regimental institutes, the charge of cricket and tennis grounds, as clerks, orderlies, grooms, etc. Till this can be changed, and some expedient found for relieving troops, who should be undergoing training in their duties as combatants, from such work as above mentioned, the Committee feel that the training of the officer in the art of war must be mainly theoretical, with the inevitable result that in the opening stages of a campaign British troops must incur grave risks of disaster."

There is no getting away from this damning fact—it is proved over and over again by the evidence before the Committee—that under the existing regimental system the training of both officers and men in a home battalion is an absolute impossibility. To what is this due? It is due primarily and almost entirely to the linked-battalion system. That is a matter I hope to be able to go into on another occasion. I will therefore only remind the House now that, whatever the upholders of the linked-battalion system may say for it, they cannot deny that it reduces the home battalions to a mere "ragged depôt," as one of the officers described it before the Committee, and deprives it of almost every quality which goes to make up a fighting unit. I wonder if the House is really aware of the actual condition of the home battalions? Lord Wolseley described them as "squeezed lemons," but that, after all, does imply a certain condition of permanency, if not of very great usefulness. As a matter of fact, however, they are mere military turnstiles, through which recruits pass in an endless procession on their way to the battalions abroad, under conditions which are as little calculated to give young soldiers a proper training, to instil into them any sense of *esprit de corps*, or to make them feel at home in the Army, as would a few nights in an East-End doss-house. Let me give the House a case from my own knowledge which will show the House the impossibility of training a regiment under these conditions. In this particular case there are eight captains, four only of whom were with the regiment, three on paper, and one in India.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): At what date? Is that at the present time?

*MR. ARTHUR LEE: Not at the present moment. As the right hon. Gentleman himself has said, the present is a transitional period, and it is impossible to draw any reliable lesson from it. This is a recent case, and I shall be happy to give the right hon. Gentleman any details.

*MR. BRODRICK: I only wanted to know whether it occurred during the war or during a normal period.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE: This did occur during the war, but the facts I am stating represent, I think, the normal condition. But perhaps I can satisfy the right hon. Gentleman by another case—I have several here—of a crack regiment at Aldershot, which illustrates the normal condition of the battalions at home in peace-time. How is the training of such a battalion carried out? In the month of February or March company training commences, and about the same time the battalion is expected to send 300 or 400 men abroad as drafts, with the result that the companies are depleted of every able-bodied man they possess, and start their company training with perhaps 40 men, most of whom are recruits or ineffectives. But company training has to go on, and, when it is nearly finished, a fresh batch of raw recruits come in from the depôt. Just about then battalion training commences, and these recruits have to go on with it without knowing anything at all of the company training which preceded it. After about six weeks, just as brigade training commences, another lot of recruits dribble in, and they have to go through brigade training without any knowledge of the company or battalion training. Later in the year the manœuvres come on, and another batch of recruits filter in and are expected to take their part in the movements of Army Corps without any experience of the previous trainings. This is the system under which the War Office expects an officer to train his regiment and fit his men to meet the enemies of the country. I am guilty of no exaggeration; this is no funny story, but a description of the normal system which exists in the home battalions at Aldershot, our chief military training school, and the head-quarters of the First Army Corps, which is supposed always to be ready at a moment's notice to take the field. But no other system is possible as long as we cling to the ridiculous fetish of the linked battalion system. In India the conditions are entirely different. A battalion there is kept filled up with practically all the able-bodied men that its unfortunate brother, the "squeezed lemon," at home is able to produce, and these men are available for actual military work. All the fatigues are done by natives, and no able-bodied fighting men are taken away for officers' servants, generals, gardeners, Governors' boatmen, or any other non-military but perhaps more interesting employment. Both officers and men are available for actual military work, and are able to learn their business, with the result that the regiment becomes an efficient fighting unit.

What is the remedy for this condition of affairs? The first remedy is the very obvious one of having all fatigues, non-military duties, and odd jobs done by pensioners or reservists, who would be only too glad of the work. This would permit the so-called fighting men to attend to their proper duties. The second necessity is to develop the present Military Manœuvres Act in order that manœuvres may be carried out on a proper scale all over the country. I understand, however, that the right hon. Gentleman is doing something in that direction. But the primary and fundamental remedy is to abolish, root and branch, the present linked battalion system. Of course, if you abolish it you will have to put something in its place, and the only reasonable system to put in its place is that of supplying all battalions, whether at home or abroad, with recruits from great central depôts, as is done with such marked success in the case of the Guards and Marines. That is a large reform, but until it is carried out the home battalions will not, and never can, in any sense of the word be effective units. The right hon. Gentleman, before he devotes his abilities to the construction of Army Corps, should give his attention to the question of making efficient the battalions and other units which will subsequently form those Army Corps.

In conclusion, I hope I have made clear to the House what are the chief obstacles in the way of carrying out any efficient training at present, and also indicated, though necessarily very briefly, the chief remedies that should be applied to the existing abuses. As far as we can judge, nothing is being done in these directions. Surely the right hon. Gentleman is not content that the present vicious system should go on, and these abuses remain? At any rate, I do not think he can ignore the forcible and unanimous condemnation of the existing system by the Committee selected and appointed by himself, or the conclusions at which, after long and careful study, they arrived. In my opinion, that Report ought to be either disproved or else accepted and acted upon. I beg to second the Motion.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'in the opinion of this House, the altered conditions of modern warfare render necessary radical changes in the system of professional training of the officers and men of our Army and Auxiliary Forces, which proved inadequate during the late war' instead thereof."—(*Col. Long.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR A. HAYTER (Walsall): I venture to think that whatever views we hold on either side of the House as to the military training of officers there can be no difference of opinion as to the importance of this subject; and, therefore, I think the House is under a debt of gratitude to the hon. and gallant Member for Worcestershire for bringing this question before us. Neither do I think it is possible to deny that this is an opportune moment to undertake an examination of this question, because we have just had issued the evidence upon the education and training of officers, in the form of a Blue-book, collected by a Committee presided over by the present Home Secretary, whose able Report has been compiled by the exertions of himself and the Secretary of that Committee. If we read only the opening paragraphs of this important Report we shall see that what we have reaped we have sown, and we shall see that a great deal of the very unsatisfactory condition of military education in this country is owing to the way in which the Education Department of the Army has been starved. If the House will allow me to read the figures they will see that we have for a number of years been gradually reducing the amount granted for military education. In 1890-91, for an Army of 143,000 Regulars, the amount taken for military education was £112,500, and of that the greater part was taken for a regimental schools, and the whole sum spent upon the education of officers and cadets was only £41,000. Coming to 1901-02, for an Army of 209,000 Regulars, the Military Education Vote was £119,000, and out of a total

Vote of £30,000,000 we spent only £40,000 on technical military education for the officers and cadets who are to lead those men in battle, or 15 per cent. of the whole.

With regard to the expenditure on Army education there is also a reduction upon the amount granted for foreign languages. In former days—speaking of ten years ago—there was £4,000 or £5,000 granted as special prizes for officers to qualify in foreign languages, but that has dropped down now to £550. A greater change still is that we have abolished the military education department which used to be so ably carried on at Winchester House, and which cost £7,242, and we placed in its stead one single officer, under the military secretary, General Grove, at the magnificent salary of £800 a year. Directly General Grove came into office the war commenced in South Africa, and he has stated that he never had time to undertake military education at all. He rejoiced to think that one of the first steps which the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State took was to appoint a thoroughly efficient officer such as General Hildyard at the head of the military education, making him responsible for the whole military education of the Army. I am glad to see also that the right hon. Gentleman has taken £6,000 additional to increase the accommodation at Sandhurst and to improve the system, root and branch, which is going on there.

Now I come to the Report of the Committee, and I would ask the House to consider how very important this statement is. On page 20 the condition of Sandhurst is dealt with, and the Committee report :—

> "The Committee regret to report that the general condition of education at the Royal Military College is far from satisfactory. In the first place the cadets cannot be expected to derive much benefit from Sandhurst when it is clearly established that they have absolutely no inducement to work. This inducement is not afforded by the number of marks necessary to qualify for a commission, nor by the fact that those who fail to reach the low qualifying standard demanded are excluded from the Army. Indeed there is too much reason to fear that even those cadets who fail to attain this standard have been commissioned none the less."

That is not particularly creditable to Sandhurst, but I am quite certain—and I speak as a former visitor of the military colleges — that the great error we have always made at Sandhurst is that we put a too severe examination on those who enter, whereas we put a very feeble and easy test upon them when they go out. The result is that these cadets have no inducement at Sandhurst to work. They all know that unless they commit some grave offence against discipline, or unless they are exceptionally indolent, they will be able to obtain their commissions ; and we have had abundant evidence that if these young officers do not learn their profession at the college they will never learn it afterwards. I hope, from the recent appointments which have been made at Sandhurst, we shall see a complete change of all this. For the last few years the head of Sandhurst College has been looked upon as a sort of easy berth for an old officer, and I am glad that the right hon. Gentleman is making an effort to improve matters at Sandhurst. With regard to the professors I wish to quote a word or two from the Report. It states—

> "That if the cadets have no inducement to work at Sandhurst, it is equally clear that the instructors have no inducement to teach. Professors appear to be selected from men who desire to have a quiet billet ; they are taken on probation, but of late have never been sent back."

They are men who wish to retire from active work for a certain time, generally for five years, in order to obtain a berth which will not necessitate their moving their families about from quarter to quarter. They do not drill the cadets or take them into the field and instruct them, and they have no intimate touch with them, and I maintain that that is the very thing which they require. If I may say so, I think there are very serious objections to the mode of teaching which goes on. One of the most useful things a young officer can be taught is to drill his own squad. At present they are nearly all non-commissioned officers who conduct riding, drilling and gymnastics, and they have no revolver practice, and no drill taught by the officers. The Committee lay stress upon the fact that the education in the riding school should be made equal to what is wanted in the field. I trust that the new broom put in at Sandhurst by the right hon. Gentleman will bring entirely new methods and new modes of instruction. Another point which I wish to draw the attention of the House to is that there appears to be an unanimous opinion that the University candidates have provided us with some of the best recruits we have had. I will quote what General Groves says upon this point. He says—

> "The best class of candidates, I think everybody will agree, are the University candidates. We get very good ones from the Militia and Sandhurst, but, taken as a whole, the University candidates are by general acknowledgment the most satisfactory."

I hope the right hon. Gentleman will do all he can with the authorities at Oxford and Cambridge to secure a more steady and sufficient supply of candidates from the Universities than at present. In the regiment with which I have been connected, the London Rifle Brigade, I had a difficulty in regard to obtaining good officers, and I put myself in communication with the Universities, and they supplied officers to my regiment for some time with great satisfaction. If the University candidates are allowed to join the Militia regiments or the University Corps they will then obtain sufficient military knowledge to enable them to compete satisfactorily at the examination. After what has been said in this Bluebook and the fact that these young officers have not proved wanting in discipline, I hope the right hon. Gentleman will do all in his power to secure a larger supply of University candidates. I notice that the Committee recommend that Sandhurst should be considerably enlarged. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman is now taking anything in this vote for new buildings at Sandhurst, but it would be a very great thing if we had room there for about 650 cadets. The ground there is very favourable, and considerable building might be undertaken there tolerably cheaply, whereas, if the college is to be a success, it would be of very great use to have more accommodation.

I wish to say one or two words upon the question of officering the staff. I find that there is a general consensus of opinion that the present system is not satisfactory. I think it would be advisable to form a staff corps, and not send officers from their regiments. My own opinion is that we should do better by making a man a staff officer, and keep him in that position, and let him make his career from the staff instead of seconding him in his regiment, to which he returns. There is also the question of the cavalry expenses. The right hon. Gentleman to-day made a statement with regard to that, but I wish to enlarge upon it, because I think it is of the greatest possible importance that we should not allow what is going on to continue. It has been said that you are obliged to fix a very low standard for candidates because they cannot find men who possess the means to meet the expenditure of the cavalry. Surely it would be a very good thing to summon the cavalry commanding officers and insist that the expenses should be kept within bounds, so that a man having only £200 a year besides his pay might be able to join. I notice that those joining are to receive the gift of the horse, and there will be less changes in the uniform, and these are indications that the right hon. Gentleman is anxious to do what is necessary in this direction. We must also keep down the regimental drags and polo tournaments, and you must not allow the expenses to be so high that men of £200 a year cannot join cavalry regiments. With regard to the last opinion which the Committee expressed as to the general training, I most heartily agree. I most thoroughly and entirely agree that whatever regulations you make you will never be able to carry them out unless you adopt a system of promotion by merit. You must see that the examinations are honestly and properly carried out, but it rests with the Commander-in-Chief and the right hon. Gentleman to see that all the avenues to the highest posts in the Army are open as in other professions to the men who show industry, ability, and enterprise.

*MR. BRODRICK: I think we must all admit the general interest of the discussion which my hon. and gallant friend has introduced. Amid the many jarring notes which are heard in this House on the question of military reform I imagine that there is one subject which, at all events, stands as an oasis on which we may all join hands. I am sure that the speeches which have already been heard have tended very much in that direction. Now I cannot approach this subject without expressing my warm thanks, not only to those who have brought the matter forward, but to the Education Committee for their very valuable, prolonged, and most successful labours, and for the Report which they signed. I think anybody who has read that Report must see that, although they may disagree with some individual portions of it, that it has taken a broad and deep view of the whole subject, and put before us a series of propositions with which we must be more or less in accord. I cannot help, in referring to the Committee and thanking its members for their labours, also saying a word about one of the officers mentioned by an hon. Member, Captain Cairnes. I think the last public act in his life was the sending round of the Committee's Report for signature, and I am afraid that his labours on the Committee had much to do with his untimely death. Speaking on questions of education, it is a sad coincidence that only a few days ago there passed away also another officer of great promise, Colonel Henderson, who had taken the greatest possible interest in this subject, who had progressed far on a career of great promise, and whose name, I may say, even at the very moment he was taken ill, we were considering for a high post in connection with education. I am sure those of us who are now dealing with these subjects cannot help feeling sad that these two careers have so early closed, and deep regret at the loss of two men who in this particular line would have been able to show their brilliant talents with great advantage to the nation.

Looking at this subject of education, I venture to say there is not a single point in a boy's career, from the beginning before he enters the Army up to the time at which he commands a regiment, that his education does not require a more careful consideration and organisation than it has received hitherto. I think that the public schools have done an immense amount to adapt themselves to our more modern requirements with regard to the education of Army candidates, but I think a considerable amount still remains to be done, and I also feel that whatever we may lay down here, whatever the rules the War Office may carry out on the initiative of a Committee, or of this House, we shall not succeed in getting the full support of the educational world, unless we to some extent bring the educational world into concert with us, and into council with regard to these matters. I regard that as being at the outset the most important point with which we can deal. I do not say, nor am I competent to say, how far it is necessary that there should be any considerable change for other purposes, besides that of entrance to the Army, in the old system of classical education. All I can say is that I see in the Report of this Committee, and also in the comments which have been made upon it by those who are well qualified to speak in the educational world, a very considerable wavering as to the desirability of continuing our old system of classical education up to the extent to which it has gone hitherto.

It is for the reason that I feel, that a new departure for the Army which would so very largely affect the public schools in the country would have a far-reaching effect, that I should hesitate myself, even with the admirable advice which may be tendered to me by those associated with me in my Department, to state absolutely a new departure with regard to the syllabus which would be required of Army candidates. But what I propose to do at the outset, and at once, is to support the new Director General of Military Education and Training, Sir Henry Hildyard, whose appointment I think has been universally well received, and who brings to this office not only the best theoretical experience and training, but also the most recent practical experience in the field; we bring to his assistance an advisory board as suggested by the Education Committee. A great deal has been said, and some fun has been poked at me, for referring too much work to committees or boards. I am perfectly immune to those attacks. I have constituted, it is true, three or four committees or boards, and I venture to say that when my successor, however soon or however late, comes into my place he will tell me that the War Office Council, a board established at the instance—or rather which has taken its present form very largely at the instance—of Sir Clinton Dawkins' Committee, and the Medical Advisory Board, have both of them been successful beyond all expectations in forwarding the work of the Department. I quote the Medical

Advisory Board because that board is started precisely on the same principle as the Educational Board which we propose to establish, in order to bring the great medical establishments in the country, and the scientific attainments of civilians, into contact with our military problem, and to obtain their advice and support. That is precisely what we desire to do in connection with the education of the Army.

I propose, therefore, that the Director General of Military Education should for all purposes connected with the examination of candidates before they enter the Army, and with their training before they are commissioned, have a board consisting of the four heads of the military colleges—Woolwich, Sandhurst, the Staff College and the Ordnance College—and that he should be assisted also by two representatives of the Universities, by one selected by the Incorporated Association of Headmasters, one selected by the Headmasters' Conference, and one by the Royal Society, so that we may ensure that scientific attainments are not forgotten, and further, that there should be two nominated members, I think, by the Secretary of State, as was recommended by the Committee. I propose to leave in their hands the settlement of this syllabus of examination. I do not think that I should be expected to give an off-hand opinion, or even a mature opinion, upon the several minute questions raised by the Committee. When the Committee decided that they would do their best to avoid a smattering of knowledge, as is at present attained by the examination, I think many people, including educationists of importance, would hold that the Committee's own definition that it was not necessary to give definite periods of history, or definite geography in the examination papers, or that the whole subject of English in itself should include both geography and history, might lead to a smattering of knowledge. However this may be, I am sure we should be on firm ground in leaving the entrance examination to be settled by the new Advisory Board, merely providing that the whole examination for Woolwich and Sandhurst for the Army and for the Militia should be held, if possible, in one examination, and that the higher the candidate gets the wider should be his choice of selection as to the branch of the Army he wishes to join.

Having got our candidates, I am bound to say that I think we shall require much better military training of them before they are admitted to the Army than has been the case heretofore. I do not wish to say a word on the statement of the Committee, or even on the evidence of prominent officers, as to the deficiencies in the training of our officers as disclosed in the war; still less do I wish to compare them with foreign officers, except to say that some of those who make the most confident comparisons between our officers and foreign officers, to the disadvantage of our own officers, must remember that foreign officers have, as a rule, not been tested in war as our officers have been; that our officers have been tested in very varied forms of warfare, and that, speaking generally, in our small wars we have every reason to be proud of the attainments of our officers. But at the same time there is one abiding fact that we cannot get away from, and that is that before they enter the Army, our officers do not receive the same continuous and varied training as the officers of the Navy, and that, after they take their commissions, they certainly are not called upon, or have not been called upon, to give the immense and minute attention to the profession which is required from officers of the Navy; and which officers of the Navy give with a self-denial as to the leaving of other advantages and other indulgences, which I must say is a marvel to some of us who are accustomed to greater ease in life. I hope I shall not be thought hard if I say that in the opinion of the military authorities one year at Sandhurst shall not be sufficient, and that we shall require two years at Sandhurst, as is already required at Woolwich.

We shall preserve the main avenues of entrance to the Army as they are at present, but in each case require a higher degree of efficiency and training. With regard to the Sandhurst question I need not say very much. The Committee has made some excellent proposals. Colonel Kitson has adopted practically the whole of the Committee's proposals, with the exception of the development of Sandhurst, which now produces far too small a number of officers, owing to the increase in the Army, but this difficulty can only be remedied by a considerable increase of the buildings. That is a point on which there will be universal unanimity in this House, with the sole exception of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I am not without hope that I will be able to persuade my right hon. friend to take the matter into pretty early consideration. In the meantime, we have completely remodelled the course at Sandhurst. That course has become a much more practical course. There is far more open-air work; the college has been reorganised in its internal arrangements, and has a new organised battalion under proper officers, a system which appears to be working most admirably. I understand that far more attention is being given both to shooting and riding—matters to which the right hon. Gentleman called attention. But it would be useless for us to arrange for better training at Sandhurst, unless at the close of their career there the officers have some inducement to pass out well. We have already arranged that the Indian cadetships shall be a matter for competition from Sandhurst and that the same rule shall apply to commissions in the Army Service Corps. With regard to the position of other candidates on leaving Sandhurst, we are awaiting representations from Colonel Kitson, because this is a subject which is really so vital to the whole question, and Colonel Kitson and Sir H. Hildyard have so recently been appointed, that we thought it would not do to make precipitate proposals; and, moreover, it would be impossible to apply any proposals precipitately to candidates who entered under an entirely different set of conditions.

Our determination is that, unless a cadet applies himself at Sandhurst, he will not get his commission in the ordinary course. In addition, we propose that the cadets both at Sandhurst and Woolwich shall go into camp, as those at Woolwich did last year, for at least one month, and perhaps six weeks, in the summer. My belief is that the open-air experience gained at camp was not only appreciated by the cadets, but was warmly supported by the commandant, and well reported on by Sir Evelyn Wood. I have not the least doubt that in the two years at both these institutions the time can easily be spared. As to entrance through the Militia, that has hitherto been regarded as the back-door to the Army, though I am not sure that the statistics would bear out that view. I once went into the statistics as to how many officers on the staff or in command of regiments had gone through Sandhurst and through the Militia; but I found it impossible to get from them any decisive evidence that less good candidates were obtained from the Militia than from Sandhurst. But we are stiffening the requirements at Sandhurst; and, with regard to the Militia, I am clear that if a less severe examination is asked for in the Militia increased military training ought to be demanded. The actual military training at Woolwich and Sandhurst will be very considerable under the new system. Most authorities are agreed that the time between the two trainings of a young man who passes through the Militia into the Line is very difficult to spend properly. We propose to fill in that time by attaching a man to some Line battalion for three or four months in the interval between the two trainings, and that the granting of a commission should be dependent not only on the good report of the commanding Militia officer, but on that of the commanding Line officer as well.

Another and most important new channel of entrance to the Army is through the Universities. I agree with everything that has fallen from the hon. Gentleman and from my hon. friend who speaks with such knowledge as to the advantag eof getting University candias dates. Personally I may be prejudiced, many people are, in favour of Public School and University training, but I regret the system by which the Army is mainly officered by men who leave the public schools at seventeen, and who lose the last two years, which is the most valuable period in the public school training. That is the period in which they have responsibility, and are looked up to by their schoolfellows. It is also the period of rushing, by cramming, through examinations. By being put into a regiment at nineteen, or nineteen and a half, young officers are practically allowed after passing through Sandhurst to abandon all further training except in details of military work at the very age when men in the Public Schools and Universities are undergoing the severest application This is to carry the principle of professional as against intellectual training very far indeed, and has led to unfortunate results. Well, I hope the House will not think I am unduly stretching in favour of the University, but I am very anxious to secure for the Army men who have had a Public School and University career, and to enable them to enter the Army on equal terms with the men who have not. We propose that a boy shall complete his period at the public school; and we shall require that before he is twenty he shall have passed the examination for Moderations at Oxford, or some equivalent examination at another University. I have had the greatest possible help from Cambridge University in this matter. The authorities there have taken up this subject in the most vigorous and broad-minded spirit, and the other Universities will, I hope, follow this example. Within the next few weeks we propose to confer with the Universities as to the establishment of the new system.

Before the age of twenty the intending officer must have not only passed this test examination, but must have done six weeks' training with a Line battalion or a Regular unit at Aldershot or elsewhere. That can easily be done in the long vacation, which lasts for three or four months. Having done this we shall be prepared to give the candidate a provisional commission at the age of twenty, and although he may return to the University he will rank in the Army from the age of twenty, instead of waiting till the end of his University career. He will be required to take honours at the University, and we shall ask the Universities to include in the honours examination two or three military subjects—tactics, military topography, and military history—and to provide proper lectures on those subjects. Any candidate who has passed with the requisite honours, and who has twice done a six weeks of military training during his University career, will be allowed to enter the Army, provided that he enters it before the age of twenty-two, as having been commissioned from the age of twenty. I believe that that concession, which has never been made before, will provide us with the very best possible class of candidate, as it will enable any father to feel that he can give the son who enters the Army the same education as he would have in any civilian profession, and that his time has not been lost.

Now we come to what has been dwelt on to-day by my hon. and gallant friend—the difficulty of training officers after they have entered the Army.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE: Does the right hon. Gentleman intend to accept the recommendations of the Committee as to increasing the number of commissions to the colonies?

*MR. BRODRICK: Yes, I hope we shall be able to do so very shortly, but at present we are in a difficulty. We have 700 officers above strength, in view of the demand for officers during the War, and until the normal level has been reached it is difficult to give even the usual number of commissions to the Militia. We propose, therefore, to continue at present the twenty commissions to the colonies, and as soon as possible to raise the number to some extent as recommended in the Report of the Committee.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire): Before the right hon. Gentleman passes from this subject may I ask him whether the new system is to be extended to other Universities than Oxford and Cambridge?

*MR. BRODRICK: Of course the same opportunities will be extended to other Universities. We have not yet been able to confer with them all, but we shall ask them to confer with the Director-General as to the possibility of instituting the sort of course we propose. We have been very anxious to permit the military training of a University candidate to be carried out in the Volunteer corps of his University, but we came to the conclusion that it would be extremely difficult to make any permanent arrangement which would be sufficient training. We must make certain that the University candidate should know something of his military work, as, when he joins his regiment there will be officers junior to him who may have served with the regiment for two years or more. We come now to the most important part of the subject. How are we to secure the efficient and adequate training of officers, having regard to the extreme regimental feeling which forbids that any officer should be placarded as inefficient. The Commander-in-Chief fully recognises the force and truth of the Committee's statements on this subject. At present no sufficient incentive is given to the officer to energise. There are penalties, and one of them which has acted admirably is that practically every officer is provisionally commissioned. If after two years with his regiment a young officer is reported, in writing, by three senior officers as not likely to make an efficient and useful officer, and if that opinion is confirmed by the commanding officer, the commission may be withdrawn. That, I may say, has worked admirably. There have been cases where it has worked rather hardly, and there have been cases where it might have been applied and it has not. But, speaking generally, it has had an admirable effect; and I may say incidentally—though I do not wish to go into this subject—that it entirely absolves the War Office when we take severe measures against those who are guilty of making matters unpleasant for a subaltern when he goes into their regiment, because, if he is not likely to make an efficient officer, there is no difficulty whatever in his senior finding that out, and reporting it without subjecting him to any inconvenience. But after that is done what happens? After these two years have passed there is no power whatever to prevent an inefficient officer from going up, by seniority, side by side with the officer who is giving the whole of his heart and soul to his profession. The officers who study their profession are practically on a par with the officers who do not. Both are equally promoted; both, unless one is a conspicuous failure, have the same amount of leave; both have the same eligibility for staff employment; and both—or rather, perhaps, the officer who energises least, but happens to be popular in society, has often the best opportunity for obtaining the offer of extra-regimental employment on the staff of a Governor or some other functionary, which may take him away from his regiment for a very pleasant visit for five years, while the work of the regiment is falling on the other officer. The Commander-in-Chief feels that the time has come, if possible, to put a stop to this.

The scheme which has been recently brought before him by the new Director-General, and which has been approved by the Commanderin-Chief, and which we propose to adopt, is this. In each unit an annual course of training has been prescribed, and certain months are devoted to practical field training. At the conclusion of that period there will have been an opportunity for the merit of different officers in the regiment to be weighed. We propose that three senior officers—not merely the colonel, but the colonel assisted by the two next in seniority—should classify their officers who are over one year's service in two classes according to their general efficiency, their power of training and leading men, and the state of their companies or squadrons. And in the case of subalterns we propose to introduce a system allowing a subaltern responsibility for half a company as a captain is for the whole, and a subaltern of cavalry responsibility for a troop as the captain is for a squadron. According to that he will be qualified either as efficient or indifferent. It will be possible also for any commanding officer and his two senior majors to bring before the brigadier the name of any officer of exceptional merit for special and accelerated promotion, and in such a case, which may be rare, a wide knowledge of languages will not be forgotten. The brigadier will be responsible for satisfying himself that this classification is a proper classification. Our motive is not to secure a principle of selection. This may sound absurd, but I believe you will never get selection in the lower ranks of the Army which will really tend to efficient working. If there are four men who are fitted for promotion and No. 3 is a little better than No. 1 and No. 2, you put a slur, and an unmerited slur, on No. 1 and No. 2 by promoting No. 3 in June and his seniors in November below him. Our object is to reject those officers who are not really qualified.

When there are three or four good officers, the senior of them ought to go up. That is our view. If, on the other hand, there are three or four indifferent officers they will fall into the second category. They will not get promotion; they will not get extra-regimental employment; they will not get the same indulgence leave. It will lie on the colonel and his senior officers to show to the brigadier that officers who are classified as efficient are efficient; and when it comes to the question of the manœuvres, where a great deal may be learned, the officer conducting the manœuvres may bring before the brigadier the names of officers who have shown themselves as efficient. I believe these changes will have a wide-reaching effect on the lower ranks of the Army. We propose that the brigadier or general officer in command of an Army Corps shall, by practical examination, test the tactical power of any man in the field who is to be appointed to the command of a unit; and there will be a system of winter study with an examination conducted regimentally, but considerably under the superintendence of an officer from headquarters with military knowledge. We regard the present A and B examinations for promotion as being practically worthless; and we intend to replace them by a more practical test, in the designing and the carrying out of which the general officer commanding an Army corps will be able to appoint an officer from his own staff, and will have the assistance of an officer from headquarters.

One word about confidential reports. I believe that confidential reports rendered to the War Office are of great use in estimating the value of officers. But I believe there would be a greater use if the colonel was able, or felt himself able, to write more freely of an officer who is sitting by him at the same table. It is an extremely difficult thing to ask a man to report adversely on the man who is to sit either opposite or next to him for the next twelve months and to read out that report to him. At the same time, there is a feeling against asking him to report as it were behind the officer's back. What we propose is that a bad report shall be concurred in by three senior officers, and that the brigadier, or the general commanding the district where there is no brigadier, shall have the necessity of sending for the officer and of explaining to him the points on which amendment is required. The further off you can put the unpleasant necessity of reading out to an officer a report which is made against him, the more certain you are to have confidential reports upon which you can act. Therefore, in the lower ranks of the Army, we hope in future to have a system of promotion which will be a practical one; which will, at the same time, enforce some degree of study, and which will distinctly separate between the active, vigorous, and painstaking officer and the man who means to take his profession slowly, quietly, and inefficiently; and that officer, after two bad reports, after two whole years in which he is found not efficient, will be required to send in his papers.

I agree very much with what fell from my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Evesham when he said that if you thoroughly train your officers they will train their men. My hon. friend the Member for Fareham alluded to a great many subjects which we have heard here on previous occasions, and on which he speaks with great authority. He wants all fatigues to be done by others in order that the numbers in the ranks may be greater. Nobody would more like to see fatigues handed over to others than I should; but every man that you call in means that you are adding to the regiment a very large staff—a staff, say, of 100 men, or whatever it may be; and this, at the moment when we are being asked to reduce expenditure in every direction, would be adding a small separate Army in order to allow the present Army to manœuvre more freely. I do not believe that that is a proper arrangement. Of course, we shall always have the difficulty that our recruits do not come in at the same time. There will always be that difficulty so long as you have voluntary enlistment, whether you have linked battalions or depôts—a system which every soldier of experience objects to, because the training by battalions, though it may not be perfect, is far better than the training at depôts. I have seen every soldier of experience who has held office at the War Office—in fact, almost every soldier except Lord Kitchener—and they say, with one accord, that the training by battalion or regiment is incomparably better than the training at a depôt.

MR. ARTHUR LEE: Very few of those distinguished officers have themselves commanded regiments.

*MR. BRODRICK: That may be so in some cases, but the fact that none the less their testimony is so strong shows that they are not prejudiced in favour of the training by regiment. But take those who have commanded regiments and they will tell you the same. We cannot in this country obtain the full training we desire, either for our Regular forces or for our Auxiliaries. I hope it will not be imputed to me as neglect of the Auxiliary forces if I do not enter upon that subject now. I fully recognise its importance, and perhaps on a subsequent Motion I shall say something with regard to it. But, so far as the general training of officers of the Army is concerned, I say that we are at one with the object of the Motion of my hon. and gallant friend. There is, I believe, a determination among those responsible for the charge of districts and the commanders of Army Corps, as well as elsewhere, to see that the training of our officers at home in peace, so far as our ground permits and so far as the annual assemblage of units of the different Arms, on which we now insist whether we have manœuvres or not, shall be conducted cn far more practical and efficient lines than has been the case up to now. Our desire is not to penalise, but to provide that healthy competition which exists in so many regiments and which, in our opinion, may be extended to all. I believe this subject is even more vital to the Army than numbers, and it is certainly one which in the past has too much escaped attention.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I do not think that in the course of these discussions we are at all likely to have any matter brought before us of greater importance than this, or even of so great importance. Neither do I think that we shall have a Parliamentary conversation—for that is the nature of such a discussion as this—more satisfactory to the general sentiment oj the House. We have to thank the Committee which the right hon. Gentleman appointed for this admirable report. We may not agree with every line of the report, but on its main tenor and its principal recommendations I think there is substantial unanimity. There are other circumstances which, I think, we may regard with satisfaction; above all, the appointment of General Hildyard, the officer who has been selected to take the control of the education department. I am not going to enter into all the topics to which the right hon. Gentleman has referred. There are only two points on which I wish to say one or two words; but they are, in my opinion, the most important points of the whole subject. The first is this question of the training of officers after they attain the rank of officers and their encouragement to the pursuit of the study of their profession. The House will, perhaps, allow me to read—it was read once before, I think, when not so many Members were present—a passage in this report referring to this subject.

> "The Committee wish most emphatically to repeat that the only chance of a general improvement in military education—and in the consequent efficiency of the Army—lies in an honest system of promotion by merit, following upon tests conducted in an honest and practical manner, honestly reported on, and duly acted upon by the authority. So long as mediocrity is permitted to pass muster, and signal ability to meet with no substantial recognition, it is useless to hope for any valuable results from verbal amendments in the regulations. No examinations, however well planned, either of candidates before entry or of officers after joining, can of themselves make good officers. Nothing but inducements in the shape of certain reward for good work done either in peace or in war, on the staff or in the regiment, can raise the standard of knowledge throughout the commissioned ranks."

All those who have watched these matters will agree with me when I say that for many years back there has been a want of courage on the part of military officers who administer the Headquarters Staff of the Army in these matters. They have been acting in the penumbra of the old purchase system. That system gave an officer a sort of fee simple of his own commission and of his position in the Army; and it is difficult to get out of the heads of most of the most influential officers still in the Army the idea that there is not some right of that sort. The country was pledged to deal, when abolishing the old system of purchase, with great liberality, as I think, with the pecuniary rights of officers. That further established the idea in men's minds that an officer had a sort of vested interest in his commission, and in his right to remain in his commission and to receive promotion by seniority, unless there was some objection against him. The right hon. Gentleman has shown with considerable elaboration the system by which he thinks that this can be best overcome. I think the plan which he stated was a judicious plan, especially as regards the way in which he proposed to treat subalterns so as not to penalise individuals, but gradually to let it be felt that they were marked as not likely to pursue the career with advantage to themselves or to the service, and thus easily to slip them out of the position in which they found themselves. That I believe to be absolutely essential. Our Army differs from most armies in this, that there are many young men of spirit calculated to make to a certain extent, and up to a certain degree of responsibility, excellent officers, who go into the Army with no intention of pursuing it as a life career, but merely to pass a few of the best years of their lives in the service of their country, with credit to themselves and doing some good for their day and generation. We do not wish to do anything which will hustle young men of that sort out of the service. At the same time we do not want any example which they may set of the comparative indifference to the higher advantages of military learning to have a prejudicial effect on those who are willing to devote earnestness and seriousness to their profession. The right hon. Gentleman has a full appreciation of what I have been stating, and I can only trust that he may be able to overcome the evil.

Now I pass to the second question to which I wish to call the attention of the House, and there I am not so sure of having in every sense the sympathy of hon. and gallant Members. I turn to the entrance of officers. Are we to treat this question as if it were a mere matter of gleaning from the Public Schools and Universities, and from the Militia, the best young fellows that can be obtained? Is the avenue to the commissioned ranks in the Army to be shut against any but the leisured classes? That is a crucial question. It is a question that may be treated separately, because I recognise the enormous difficulties in the way, and I recognise also that it need not directly affect prejudicially anything that is proposed in this report. Go on in your improvements; improve your methods of obtaining your young men from the Universities and public schools if you like; but I think it would be a monstrous mistake if we were to imply by such a debate as this that it was from those classes of the community, and those classes alone, that we expected to find those who should fill the commissioned ranks of the Army. One thing, of course, which can be done —and it is fundamental — is to reduce expenses. The right hon. Gentleman again is fully alive to that difficulty and has done something to cure it. I am afraid he will have to go still further. In the cavalry the state of things is even worse, because it is not the leisured classes only to whom access has practically been confined in past years, it is the rich classes. I put in a plea for a larger and wider view of the whole question. Besides these avenues to the commissioned ranks of the Army, there should be some means of men rising from the ranks in the Army, or being brought in from the more general mass of the community. Of course, a few commissions are given, as it is said, to the ranks, every year. But what are they? They are mostly commissions either given to young men, still of the leisured class, who have enlisted on purpose to obtain them, or they are given to excellent soldiers to fill certain posts as quartermasters and so forth, not in the regular line of promotion. I submit it to the House that when we are at the end of this great war, in which both officers and soldiers have done so well and deserved so well of us, we ought to do something to take advantage of this opportunity and promote the general, personal, direct interest of the mass of the people in the country, not only in the Army at large as an entity, but in the commissioned ranks of the Army. When we are endeavouring by some little additional pay or comfort to get better recruits into the Army, what can we do more likely to contribute to that result than to open to them, to a degree unknown before, access to the commissioned ranks of the Army ?

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I cannot help thinking that part of the curriculum at Sandhurst leaves a great deal more to be desired, and that it should be more practical and less theoretical. I understand that the cadets have to clean their waistbelts whilst their servants clean their rifles. Surely it would be more in accordance with the eternal fitness of things if the men cleaned the waistbelt and the cadet the rifle. I do not know that I quite agree with what has been stated about the University training. If one man goes to the University and serves three years there, and the other is to go into the Army and to South Africa and other places and serves three years there, and at the expiration of that time both men are placed upon the same footing, I think it is putting a premium on University training which is not right and which it does not deserve.

*MR. BRODRICK: I might explain that the University candidate would have to gain honours at the University before becoming eligible for a commission, and he would have to put two terms at Aldershot in camp.

MAJOR RASCH: I am very glad to have had the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman. I may, perhaps, be allowed to say a word or two as to the expenses which were alluded to by my hon. friend the Member for Walsall just now. I have always thought it was a scandal and a disgrace that a young fellow should not be able to serve in a cavalry regiment without he has a private income of £500 or £600 a year. The result of such a system is that the sons of country gentlemen, who can shoot and ride, cannot go into the cavalry, whereas the sons of South African millionaires, who are none the worse for that, go into the cavalry, but as they can neither ride nor shoot, are not much use when they get there. The mess expenses ought to be cut down, and no doubt the Government has done a good deal in suggesting that officers may ride a trooper. But it must be understood that that may must be construed as must, otherwise the colonel of the regiment will take very good care he does not. If I might say half-a-dozen words as to the regimental expenses, which are so abnormally high, I would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that it would not be a bad plan to retire two or three cavalry colonels on half pay when the expenses went above normal. If that were done, they would soon get rid of a good deal of the expense. In my young days in the service we heard a good deal of promotion by seniority tempered with selection, but I always regarded it as stagnation by selection tempered with jobbery. I am entirely in accord with what was said about the employment of reservists. It is a very bad thing in a weak infantry battalion to strike a lot of men off duty to serve as canteen waiters, officers' servants, police, and so on. The same thing appertains to all regiments. There are cavalry regiments in which something like 80 men out of 700 are struck off the strength for these duties. I am sorry the right hon. Gentleman is not able to employ reservists in this connection. If he had been, he would have killed two birds; he would have employed a very deserving class of men, and at the same time would have prevented men from being taken away from their duties, and so better men would be brought into the line.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): No one would gather from this debate what are the terms of the Resolution on the Paper, for certainly every Member of the House would have thought, before he heard the debate, that the question of the preliminary education and training of officers would have been out of order on this Resolution. The terms of the Resolution are—

> "To call attention to the professional training of the officers and men of our Regular and Auxiliary Land Forces; and to move, That, in the opinion of this House, the altered conditions of modern warfare render necessary radical changes in the system of professional training of the officers and men of our Army and Auxiliary Forces, which proved inadequate during the late war."

And nearly half the debate has turned on the question of whether we are to obtain officers from the Universities, and what is to be the nature of the'r, not military but general, training before they become officers at all. As the Secretary of State for War has dealt with this during the greater portion of his speech, may I make him this suggestion. Let him beware of trying to obtain from the Universities general University training in the form in which he has accepted University representation, because he will not get it. An honour degree in the third class is a very inferior training for a gentleman to an ordinary degree. I therefore beg the right hon. Gentleman not merely to listen to the University authorities, who are only too eager to swell their numbers, but to take adviceof others thoroughly and practically acquainted with the conditions of training. Now let me turn to the Resolution itself. It calls attention to the altered conditions of modern warfare, and insists upon radical changes in the system of professional training of the officers and men which proved inadequate during the late war. Not one word has been said against that assertion by any member of the House, and the presumption therefore is that it is to go uncontradicted in this House. But it is a statement which needs this explanation that those who will be selected for the working of the new system will be those who have been responsible for the working of the old, and all the horrible defects which had been proved to exist in the old form of training of our Army are too likely to continue or creep in again, and we may allow ourselves to be misled by mere words.

The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State says he agrees with the terrible findings of the report of the Committee on Military Education, but when he comes to quote the findings he gives quite a different interpretation to that which the mover of the Amendment submits to the House. The hon. and gallant Member who moved the Amendment quoted the report as going to show that under our existing regimental and general military system men who made themselves efficient and worked hard to become good officers were penalised. The suggestion of the Committee was that the system was harming the promotion of these men and penalising them; that though they might be good officers, because they might not have shown the same good fellowship or the same keenness in regimental sport they were penalised in their promotion. What has been in the mind of the country is, I am convinced, what has been in the mind of my hon. and gallant friend, and that is the failure, shown in the eyes of the world, as regards the training of our officers and the training of our men in South Africa, and the consequent necessity of changes in that system.

The Resolution contains some words which might possibly be misunderstood. They are sound, I believe, but I think some one ought to say something about those words. My hon. and gallant friend alludes to the altered conditions of modern warfare, and unless some one says something on that matter, it may be thought that my hon. and gallant friend gives some concurrence to the suggestion that His Majesty's Government could not have foreseen what would happen in South Africa because of the conditions of the war. The sound view of this subject was stated by Moltke as far back as 1866. He pointed out what was the bearing of new conditions of war, as from time to time they were emphasised in his time by improved rifles and improved guns, and as they have been subsequently improved by smokeless powder and quick-firing guns, Moltke's argument was this, and it cannot be controverted, that this rapid and constant improvement in the conditions of warfare and weapons gave a greater advantage to the best trained troops; that it was not the less trained who were put upon an equality with the better trained, but that the better trained got a greater advantage in war. The state of things that existed with regard to our war in South Africa was all foreseen by Moltke as far back as 1865, when he said—

> "All these improvements in firearms have strengthened the defence against the attack, but the attack always has the advantage, which it must ever retain. In the end, the defender must take the offensive to attain success."

And then he points out that these improvements are facts of merely local importance, and that they cannot prevent the ultimate defeat of the defending army as a whole; that altered conditions further handicap the side on which the generals, officers and men are less skilled in the art of war. Some have said that the conditions of South Africa are peculiar. To some extent they are, but I venture to say hat no competent observer who has watched and written on this matter, and none of the foreign observers who have written on this matter, in a manner so impartial that they are more than just to our Regular Army and the training of our Army, for a moment ventured to assert that the conditions in South Africa were so peculiarly special that they account for this deficiency in training which the South African War exposed. That war has been very carefully scrutinised by some of the most distinguished authorities — General de Negrier, Captain Fournier, Commandant Painvin, and by Colonel von Lindendu, of the Prussian Military Staff. All those authorities, and all authorities who have written on this war assert the positive truth of the terms of this Resolution, that the South African War has shown in the eyes of the whole world the unsatisfactory method of our military training. It has been pointed out by great soldiers who have sat in this House over and over again that in this country there was a complete deficiency in our system of military training, and that military art was discouraged in this country.

We have discussed in this House such examples of the defective giving of, and carrying out of, orders as those of Spion Kop, Magersfontein, and Sanna's Post. But putting aside all the disasters in which either Militia, Yeomanry, or Colonial levies were concerned, and taking only those which affect the Regular Army, in the first ten months of the war, and apart from those already named, there were eleven disasters which my hon. and gallant friend could assert, taking them one by one, to be the direct result of the defective training of the Army for war. Many of those concerned the cavalry, and the cavalry have been mentioned, though perhaps not sufficiently, in this debate. The Secretary of State for War, in his explanation of the future arrangements for the Army, did not, so far as I understood him, distinguish between infantry and cavalry. I did not understand him to say how far his new system would apply generally to all officers, or how far it would be an infantry system, and how far applicable to the cavalry, or whether, in fact, all the changes were to apply to infantry and cavalry alike. Of all the failures in the South African War, that of the cavalry was the most conspicuous. There is no reason whatever why the men in the cavalry should not be, as I believe they are, as good as the men in the artillery. The way in which the gunners did their duty was marvellous. None of the mistakes made by the artillery are traceable to the action of the men; on that we are all agreed. But the men in the cavalry are of the same class; much the same reasons as lead men to go as privates into the artillery lead them to go into the cavalry; both branches of the service are extraordinarily popular with recruits, and therefore get the pick of the men. With our long service—for what we call "short service" is really long service, and would be considered very long service by Continental nations—our cavalry ought to be incomparably superior to that of any foreign Power. But can anyone for a moment suggest that they are so? The very first of the long list of disasters in the recent war was a cavalry disaster, as also, in part, was the last of the eleven in the first ten months—I mean the one known as Nitral's Nek, which led to the capture of an infant battalion, and to the censure of the Scots Greys, who were the cavalry in occupation of the neighbouring post. If you will look through these disasters, and at the occasions when we missed success where we ought to have gained it, you will find that foreign observers and those who have written with competent knowledge are justified in contending that our most conspicuous failure was in the mounted branch of our Regular Army. When we come to discuss the Army Corps Scheme we should have to repeat the objections which some of us have urged on former occasions, against believing that you can possibly use Yeomanry after fourteen days training along with Regular troops in an Army Corps. As regards the Regular cavalry itself—I leave aside the training of the auxiliary forces, though it is alluded to in the Motion—no one will deny the accuracy of the statement as to the failure of its training as displayed in the South African War.

Is it or is it not the case, as in daily conversation some of the most competent and patriotic officers assure us, that even now, against the experience of the war, an officer in the Army, and especially in the cavalry, is handicapped in his career by professional knowledge and attention to his professional duties—that he is not better but worse off for being really a better officer? I cannot but think that we have an example from the very top of the tree of the neglect of the theory which is preached in this House, which ought to prevail, and which we are told is to prevail in the future. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of manœuvres. What he proposes is most excellent, but there is no use in these manœuvres unless the men who do best in them gain by so doing. Is it not notoriously the fact that, after we had fought here for the Manœuvres Act and had forced the holding of manœuvres on a large scale, the men who did, not the best, but the worst, were preferred for important commands by the Government which passed that legislation? I know it is not altogether popular to say these things, but they are what we all say privately among ourselves. As long as that practice prevails from the top of the tree, in the Staff, and as according to the assertions made to everyone of us, it does now in the cavalry regiments, I confess that mere paper plans do not convey much conviction to my mind, and while I fully recognise the courage of the Secretary of State for War, and his desire to act upon the principles that he preaches, I say that he will have to back himself by men who are determined at all hazards to carry those principles through, because even now we see that they are not being fully applied.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): The right hon. Baronet opposite, in his very interesting speech, alluded to the great number of faults in the education of officers disclosed by the war, and spoke of the necessity of those faults being remedied. But my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War by his speech showed that he was aware of those faults, and devoted the whole of his statement to showing how those faults were to be remedied. Then the right hon. Baronet said that an officer who did the least in the manœuvres had been given one of the highest commands abroad. Will he tell the House to whom he referred?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I did not say any one officer. I should have pleasure in telling my hon. and gallant friend in private the officers to whom I refer, but I think it is rather painful to mention names in public. I will, however, name them if he presses me.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD: I will not press for them now. The right hon. Baronet maintained that in the South African War we, and apparently we alone, had been guilty of faults which had held us up to the derision and contempt of all foreign critics. Does he, with his extraordinary knowledge of foreign armies and foreign systems, maintain that the army of any foreign Power in the world, operating at the same distance from its base, would not have committed faults of equal magnitude? He also referred to a matter which belongs, I think, to the by-gone days when I served in the Army, viz., that an officer was the worse off for his professional attainments. Of course I never had any experience of that myself, but I do not think that that accusation can now, especially since the war, be brought against even that Department so full of faults—the War Office. I rather agree with the remark once made by the Secretary of State for War that there is more pressure put upon him by Members of the House of Commons with regard to their friends and relations than by any other class of the community. Many Members will bear me out in saying that they receive from day to day letters from constituents urging them to place their claims before the Secretary of State for War. I think my right hon. friend has shown to-night that he thoroughly grasps the situation, and that he has not only read, but digested, and intends to carry out most of, if not all, the reforms foreshadowed in the remarkable report of the recent inquiry. The hon. Baronet, the Member for Walsall, who went over a large portion of the question of the education of officers at Sandhurst, and in the Army afterwards, appears to be at one with my right hon. friend. He followed very closely the recommendations of the Committee. We acknowledge that education to be thoroughly defective and out of consonance with the times; we acknowledge that not only before his entrance to Sandhurst, and during his term in college, but even afterwards, the education of an officer is not fitted to present requirements. The Committee showed it most clearly, and the South African War has impressed it upon us still more.

My hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Chelmsford Division of Essex has impressed upon the Secretary of State for War how strongly we and many other officers feel with regard to the question of expense. But I believe my right hon. friend has begun to deal with this question, and that already the effects are being felt in the cavalry regiments. There is no doubt that the colonel himself is principally responsible for the extravagances. In those cavalry regiments in which there are men who devote themselves to this question the expenses are invariably below those in regiments differently situated. I like very much the idea of an advisory board to settle the syllabus of the examinations; I think the proposal commended itself to most of those who heard it. When the work done by young sailors is compared with that done by men in a similar position in the Army, it is perfectly true that the Navy shows to great advantage, and I believe it is due to the fact that at a very early stage the sense of responsibility is inculcated in the naval service. We are rapidly approaching that state of things in the Army, and the more the sense of responsibility is impressed on the younger officers of the Army the better the work will be. The question of University candidates and their concessions was very fully gone into by the Secretary of State for War. I believe it to be the case that the University candidate has shown up extremely well in his Army career. I believe that the advantages offered by the Secretary of State for War to University candidates will be the greatest possible inducement, and will make these candidates an example to the younger men in their regiments. Consequently the Army will reap the advantage of this extended system of education. With regard to education, not only should young officers be enabled to learn foreign languages, but they should also have facilities for acquiring all branches of learning. I think the House on both sides will agree that the Secretary of State for War has shown exceptional ability in grasping the lessons forced upon us by the recent war in South Africa, and if the right hon. Gentleman carries out the plans which he has foreshadowed, I believe he will reap the gratitude, not only of the whole of the Army, but also of the country.

*MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): We have had, this afternoon, a very interesting and a very satisfactory speech from the Secretary of State for War, but I would point out what the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean has alluded to, that nothing has been said upon a great part of the specific words of the Resolution before the House. The right hon. Baronet showed that nothing had been said as to the training of the officers, and I propose to show that nothing has been said as to the training of men in the Regular forces. Surely in these days of independent fighting, when companies and sections of companies are cut off from their battalions as much depends upon the intelligence of the non-commissioned officer and man as upon the intelligence and the understanding of the commissioned officer. Nothing has been said upon that point by the Secretary of State for War, or any of the speakers who have addressed the House. I should like to emphasise what the right hon. Gentleman said about the cavalry. I have been reading a book describing the operations in South Africa, where it was pointed out that while Botha's scouts were often three days in advance of the main body, the English cavalry were seldom more than one day in advance. Nothing has been said about the increased training of the cavalry, although a good deal has been said as to the education of the officers who will have to lead those men. I should like to ask whether the Secretary of State for War cannot take into consideration the possibility of doing what I think every other country does, namely, provide a school of training for non-commissioned officers.

Take the case of France. There, in every branch of the service there is an *Ecole Militaire* for cavalry, infantry, and all branches of troops, and you have nothing like it in this country, although we have great need for superior non-commissioned officers. What do they do in Germany? There they have ten special schools set aside for the training of non-commissioned officers, who are compelled to declare whether they intend to become non-commissioned officers, and if they do then they receive training in one or other of these special schools; and after they leave the service they have special advantages offered them by the State. The same system applies in Russia. In our country, with a comparatively small number of Regular soldiers, where it is essential that the non-commissioned officers should have great authority over the men, nothing at all is done either to stimulate their zeal to become non-commissioned officers or reward them when they have so become. I know that by the Army Estimates provision is to be made for some slight increase for certain non-commissioned ranks. But what is that? Either by what is offered at the moment or promise in the future there is no real inducement for a man to become a non-commissioned officer because, as a private, he gets almost the same pay as a lance-corporal. I put that as a practical point which I hope the right hon. Gentleman will take into consideration.

One other thing I should like to ask the Financial Secretary to take into consideration. Taking into consideration the respective numbers, the staff colleges abroad are much larger institutions than they are in this country. Abroad these colleges are easy to get into and more difficult to get out of satisfactorily after terminating the training, and what I would suggest is, that the system in vogue in France and Germany should obtain in this country. Commissioned officers recommended by the commanding officer are eligible to go up for the staff college examination in Germany or France. If a person does not pass sufficiently high to enable him to enter the staff college he is still eligible for a staff appointment. On the other hand, the successful candidate, after passing through the staff college, has to serve two years with the staff of the Army. What happens here? An officer goes through the staff college and spends a couple of months with the cavalry and artillery, and after that, unless he happens to be a particularly brilliant man, the staff of the Army knows him no more, and the time and money spent upon him is entirely lost to the country. That is not so in other countries, because an officer who joins the staff college in foreign countries has to pass a certain time with the staff of the Army, and the country gets the benefit of his training.

Mr. Charles Hobhouse.

Nothing was more noticeable in South Africa than the absence of good officers to do staff duties. In many instances the staff officers were not there, and those who were there did not know properly how to carry out staff as opposed to regimental duties. What is the use of Army Corps or brigades unless you have staff officers? As we exemplified in the South African War there was a great want of good staff officers, and a great many of the mishaps there were due to the inability of the staff officer in charge to grapple properly with his duties. There is one other point which has not been hitherto mentioned, although it may come up on a subsequent occasion. My point is, how are you going to promote the efficiency of the officers of the Militia and Volunteers? There are a great many hon. Gentlemen in this House who command Volunteers, and it is notorious to them that the ordinary officer of the auxiliary forces is not competent to do the duty he would be called upon to do in the field. You could not have your company officers or men fitted to command without considerable training in order to make them fit to be pitted against the troops of any foreign power, and you are relying upon a broken reed if you rely upon the men and officers of auxiliary forces solely to defend us against an attack by foreign troops. I say that you will not be doing your duty if you neglect and leave on one side the efficient training of the auxiliary officers. I hope something will be done by the right hon. Gentleman, either by demanding increased attendance at drill or classes, to bring the standard of the auxiliary officer more up to the standard attained by the Regular officer.

MR. LLEWELLYN (Somersetshire, N.): I desire to remind the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down that what he expects from them in the way of training, drill, and so forth, is the very thing which the Volunteers are complaining of. It is important to take note that, in the hon. Member's opinion, what is required now is that they should further train the officers, and with that I cordially agree. With regard to the training of Militia officers, I was glad to hear the right hon. Gentleman state that the period of compulsory idleness of young gentlemen who have taken the course through the Militia will be more profitably employed by insisting upon further training in addition to the training of their own battalion. I do not think that anyone will complain of that, and I do not think the slightest difficulty will arise when the right hon. Gentleman puts that order into force. There is one point, however, I wish to mention, and it is that, in my opinion, this training should take place as much as possible under the territorial system. I do not know whether officers of greater experience than myself will agree with me when I say that nothing has worked so well, and it is advisable that the territorial system should be carried out. Young officers who do their training first of all with the Militia battalion, and are then attached to Line battalions, look forward, when their promotion comes, to promotion in those Line battalions, with the result that the men know their officers. It has proved to be of great value to have young officers knowing personally the men under their command, and I could tell the right hon. Gentleman and the House many an instance of great importance, and the great good which has resulted from a personal knowledge of the soldiers serving under such an officer.

There is this to be remembered. It is the only time they have for the study of foreign languages. A great number of young gentlemen go abroad to perfect themselves in, or to gain a knowledge of, foreign languages, and that is of the greatest importance to themselves and to the service generally. It appears to me that that is the only period in their life they can find for the study of these languages. It may be worthy of consideration whether, as an alternative to being attached to these regiments for four or five months, it should not be considered as an equivalent that they should study foreign languages abroad. I think that is a matter of considerable importance. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition spoke just now vaguely in regard to a change which he would suggest in the selection of the class from which officers should be taken. It is a very old story. I would ask him to state definitely what fault he has to find with the young officers who fought in the South African War. If there is a class who, above all others, should have a clear opinion as to who is to lead, they should be the soldiers themselves. Have they found fault with the men who were selected to lead them? I venture to say, no. The ordinary soldier may not be able to express himself so well as hon. Members in this house, but at the same time he lets those with whom he is associated know whether the men who are placed over him are officers or not. A young officer joins a regiment, and before he is 24 hours in it the soldier knows what class of man he is. The right hon. Gentleman referred to officers being of the leisured or the moneyed class. They are nothing of the sort. They are not men of idle habits, and it cannot be said that the sons of clergymen and professional men, many of whom are in the Army, are members of the moneyed class at all. If there is one class of man who came out well in the recent war it is the young officer, who went to the front very often with little experience at all—perhaps only a month or two in a barrack square. I say that of all those who deserve well of their country none are better deserving than those young and inexperienced officers.

MR. HALDANE: The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War made a speech which was very interesting so far as it was a recognition of one or two things which had to be done. He put his finger on a number of shortcomings in the educational organisation of our Army, and then he indicated a number of projects which in themselves promise very well.

I confess that once or twice I have been carried away with enthusiasm for the schemes of the right hon. Gentleman, but in the end I have not found myself able to take so sanguine a view of the results, and if I express myself, therefore, with reserve about what the present plans are likely to amount to, it is not because I undervalue the zeal with which the right hon. Gentleman has addressed himself to this new scheme, but because I feel that everything depends on the way in which the new scheme is carried out. It is not enough to desire to do something for the Army. You must do something, if you are going to reform the educational status of the Army, with a large conception, and with some definite plan in your mind of how you are going to work at the subsequent stages. The right hon. Gentleman said something which gave me great satisfaction when he said that it is proposed to recognise the University element. This is all to the good, and I gather that the new Universities will have the same chance as Oxford and Cambridge; but it will come to nothing unless you provide some future for the newcomers in the sphere into which you are going to take them. It is important to contrast the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman with that which has been laid down for the Navy. The Navy has now, curiously, rather inverted the procedure of the right hon. Gentleman, and is running away from the public schools, and the old element is setting itself to train its officers from the beginning, taking them as young as twelve-and-a-half; and having been trained they are to specialise in one of three great Departments: the Executive Department, the Marines, and the Engineers. Well, that can be done in the case of the Navy, because you have three different kinds of occupation into which these naval officers can turn, one of which is scientific almost purely, one of which is to a very large degree scientific, and the third of which is of a more general character, but still admits of a special training. But while the right hon. Gentleman's scheme proposes to realise the value of brains for the first time in a definite fashion, so far as the Army is concerned, it seems to me to lack this; one cannot

see clearly what special application the officer who comes with the old University training is to make of the peculiar character of mind he will acquire. I quite admit that it is all to the good that he should have a training of that kind. But what occupation are you going to provide for him, what special kind for which his training has fashioned him?

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): They are interchangeable.

Mr. HALDANE: They are interchangeable, but there will be, nevertheless, room for specialists. I have studied the old scheme as closely as the hon. Member, and in that element there will be abundant room for the highest degree of special knowledge. There is no doubt that there are ample opportunities both in the engineering and artillery branches. I venture to say that there is not a better scientific training to be found in Europe than that which some of our highly-trained officers obtain at Woolwich. But there is a want of an organised career in the Army, and there is very little opportunity for an officer to make a practical application of his training afterwards as a specialist. You have got to make your Army more a place for highly educated people. To my mind it is a great misfortune that it is not so at the present time. Even in France an officer has much greater opportunities for applying his special gifts than in this country, and in Germany, where every encouragement is given to that kind of thing, an officer has boundless opportunity of obtaining recognition of the special sort of talent he may possess. Now the position of matters that we have to face is that when a man, however well educated, goes into the Army his opportunities are more contracted than they might otherwise be. How far this state of things can be obviated it is difficult to say. In this country we spend very much less money, and devote less attention, to what may be called the brains of the Army than is the case in other places. Our staff is not that highly trained, paid, and highly esteemed department of our Army which you find it in the Army of the German Empire. Far be it from us to follow the pattern of foreign countries in these matters, but I think we might bear in mind that we have a great deal to learn from foreign countries in that respect.

Whatever the merit of our young officers I agree with my hon. friend who spoke last that those who went to South Africa showed magnificent courage and devotion. But there is one thing in which they have not been striking in the past, and that is the display of special knowledge of their profession. They have been admirable in point of bravery and in the points of gentlemen, but they have been lacking in those points which ought to make the Army a learned profession so far as the learning of warfare goes. I cannot help feeling that, however good these educational projects may be, they fall short unless you work at the other end, and provide something which people will direct their energies to. It may be that this new departure of the right hon. Gentleman in bringing in a new element from the Universities will be the precursor of a larger attempt at scientific organisation of the Army, but if not, whatever you may do in point of training will not have sufficient motive force to remedy the present evil.

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.): While the discussion has been sympathetic, and to a great extent appreciative, I do not think I have heard that acknowledgment of the care, labour, and intelligence which my right hon. friend has bestowed upon his scheme which I think we have a right to expect. I have been associated for many years with a number of hon. Members who, like myself, are, from former connection with it, interested in the Army, and who are known as the Service Members' Committee. That Committee has brought many points before the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War and his predecessors on matters that seemed to require amendment, but some of which seemed almost hopeless to accomplish. I may say, however, my right hon. friend has promised to carry out many of these suggestions, and that they have actually been embodied in the very scheme which he has set before us to-night. I think we ought to be grateful to the right hon. Gentleman, and to recognise the great industry and intelligence which he has brought to bear on this scheme, and which, I hope, will result in an abundant fulfilment of his and our expectations. Of course, as the right hon. Gentleman has said, many hopeful schemes have been submitted to the House which have borne imperfect fruit, and it is quite right that the representative of the War Department should not be too sanguine in regard to the present. I believe that my right hon. friend is thoroughly in earnest and that he will do his best to perform all that he has promised. I was glad that my right hon. friend opposite entered a *caveat* against the wholesale condemnation of the young officers of the Army that, as demonstrated in the recent campaign, they were altogether wanting in training. No doubt there were a great many regrettable incidents, and there were many officers who had no training at all; but it is the height of injustice to be indifferent, insensible, or forgetful of the enormous number of cases where the utmost devotion, skill, and readiness were displayed. These officers were utterly careless of their lives in leading their men to victory. I have had the opportunity of conversing with men who had been through the most eventful years of the campaign, and I have been assured that there is no fact that has been more clearly established than the personal devotion of the officers, while the influence exercised over their men was one of the most successful features of the campaign. Men could not be got to face the terrific dangers experienced from an unseen enemy, nor could the officers have gained that control over their men unless the men had confidence in their officers.

If the debate has been somewhat discursive, I think it has been instructive. The hon. and gallant Member for Evesham referred to the difficulty of training officers on account of the depletion of the depôt battalions to fill up the service battalions. I should think that by grouping depôt battalions a better school for training officers might be formed. The Report of the Committee, which we have been considering to-night in great measure, is, I think, a sufficient answer to those who have alleged that the scheme submitted by my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War was only put forward to gain time. It is of great interest that the position of Director General of Military Education has been restored and so ably filled. It was quite impossible that the Military Secretary to the Commander-in-Chief, who was a hard-worked and responsible individual, could give that attention to military education that is required. It has always struck me that, to a great extent, the Report of the Special Education Committee was the result of pre-conceived opinions. I do not believe, having had the opportunity of seeing something of the Royal Military College, that there was any want of enthusiasm on the part of the instructors to put the cadets through their training, there or in camp, in a perfunctory way. At the same time, such positions should be given to the most active and intelligent officers and not be regarded as comfortable billets for retired officers. I question very much whether in any other Army in Europe, are the officers more completely in touch with their men than in the British Army. A great deal has been said about University training for officers of the Army. It promises very well that the University candidates should only be given a provisional commission until they have been grounded in military knowledge while completing their University education. That is not altogether a new expedient. I recollect that fifty years ago young officers of the Guards after receiving their commissions were allowed leave to finish their University course and take their degrees, and that they did as much military duty as possible during the rest of the year, so that the two branches of their education went on together.

The classification of officers carried out by a Regimental Board affords encouragement to men who are in earnest in their profession, and every man who is idle or useless is left behind. That is done in the Navy by a different process. I must say one word in reference to what fell from the Leader of the Opposition when he hoped that while we were looking forward to an improved and more instructed class of officers for the Army, it should not be imagined that the Army should only be officered by men of leisure. Now, the difficulty in the British Army of promoting men from the ranks to a commission arises very much from the very low classes from which most of our recruits spring, and, therefore, men of a superior standing ought to be attracted to the ranks. If the Report of the Inspector General of Recruiting were consulted it would be found that the recruits secured continue to be contributed in an enormous preponderance by the humbler, the idle, and the unsuccessful classes. The numbers who join the Army as a profession were very few, although there are young men who have not succeeded in obtaining commissions in open competition who enter the ranks, and by steady work and behaviour have obtained commissions and have done exceedingly well afterwards. I am glad to see that my right hon. friend is attracting such men by improved conditions of service, and by offering inducements which will enable soldiers of good character to rise from the ranks to a commission. The British Army in this respect is different from all other Armies, in which every young man must serve and from which there is an ample selection for officers. I cannot for the life of me see why a regimental mess should not be managed as the mess of a ward room on board a man-of-war is managed. In a ward room, for 2s. a day, an officer can get as good food as anyone could wish to eat, in addition to the ship rations, which are usually reputed at 1s. a day. Then again expenditure for drags and polo should not be made compulsory on the officers. I hope my hon. and gallant friend will not press his Motion, because I think we all feel that the Secretary of State for War is taking the most energetic and thorough steps in the direction in which we desire to travel.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): I am very glad to be able to concur in everything the right hon. Baronet has said with regard to the earnestness, care and devotion which the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War takes in developing his scheme. I think everyone on this side of the House is agreed on the one point—that he works as hard as he can; and not only is that felt in this House, but even some of the strongest opponents of his scheme, such as officers of the Army, say that that is the worst of it—that the Secretary of State for War is such a hard-working, straightforward, honest man, that he carries out his schemes whether they are good or bad; and that although they disagree with some of his proposals they give him every credit for his hard work and good intentions. I am sorry to say that this debate has not been as instructive as it ought to have been as regards the point on which it has been raised. It has dealt almost entirely with the education of officers before they get into the Army. That is not the point which has been raised by the Amendment, and it is not a point which anyone would wish to raise, though I hope it will be useful to the Secretary of State for War in shortening proceedings at a later period of the Session. As far as the debate has gone it has not touched on the real requirements desired by this Motion. There are two points involved; one is the education, the training, and the practice of officers after they had joined their regiments; and the other is the training and the exercise of the men. No one, I think, has cavilled at the training given at Sandhurst. Even the training of the militia or other officers was not seriously debated because all the young officers did so very well in the war, and no one had ever said that they did badly. The regimental officers in South Africa did most excellent work. Where the falling off was was in the strategic qualities of the senior officers; who, while they were subalterns and captains were never instructed in the art of war; and consequently when they came to a staff appointment, or to command a regiment or a battalion of cavalry, were deficient in their work, and made very serious blunders.

I think we have a right to ask that there should be a reconstruction in the teaching and technical work of officers. There is not enough of encouragement, not enough of compulsion for officers to work hard at the technical part of their work. I do not mean the ordinary work of getting the men to follow them in battle, because that is regimental officers' work, in which they were most successful, but I mean strategic and commissariat work; so that when the time comes when officers are appointed to higher positions they will not only be able to take a command but to carry it out in such a way that blunders will not be committed in the field. Something, no doubt, will be learned by the carrying out of manœuvres; but I am afraid the Secretary of State has a feeling that it is better to employ senior officers and save the expense of putting them on half pay. That is a wrong principle. We should employ the young officer, the man with a future before him. That is the man we have to teach, and I would plead that officers at manœuvres should be officers who will be wanted in the future, and not officers who are already in command. The officer who should take a division should be a brigadier; and the officer who should take a brigade should be a colonel. We will not be able to teach the old men much now. It is too late, and the time is too short. We must teach the young officer; and I hope that more will be done in future in that direction.

The other point, which is even still more practical, is the training of the men. At present the training of the men is carried on in a most ridiculous way, as was pointed out by the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Fareham. But the hon. and gallant Gentleman omitted to show how ridiculous a certain part of this training is. He told us that large depôts would be better than small depôts. There I entirely agree with him, and I am quite sure that the linked battalion system must break down as long as it is formed of only two links. If it had six or eight links it might work, but you cannot get on with the present double battalion system. What happens at a small depôt, say a two-battalion depôt? There are probably about 200 men there. There is the permanent staff of militia, various non-commissioned officers and men on the strength of the depôt, partly for teaching recruits and others on rest after service in India, about twenty or thirty old hands, and, at the outside, about 150 recruits. Some of the latter have been at the depot two or three months, and others only two or three days. Half of them are employed at fatigue, and the others at drill. There are very seldom a sufficient number of men to form a company for company drill, and you will see squads of two or three walking about learning various things, from the goose step up to the use of the rifle. The result is you never get a sufficient number of men together to be able to teach them properly; and the awkward squad and the cleverest of the recruits are all mixed up. I plead for the establishment of larger depôts for the training of recruits. Several hon. Members have advocated it, and the right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken referred to the excellent teaching the Guards' recruits receive at Caterham. That is exactly what is required. We should have twenty or thirty recruits every week to work together. If that can be done, as I believe it can be done, by amalgamating the different regiments—you need not change their names—instead of having two linked battalions you would have six or seven; and not only would the recruits be better taught but proper company and mounted infantry drill would be taught at each depôt, which is one of the things which is neglected under our present system of training; and there would be a regular company of mounted infantry attached to the different depôts. That is one of the most important pieces of training, and the men should be especially trained and kept at it six months at a time. By making the units larger you will also get what has often been talked of as being very necessary for the welfare of the Army, and that is that the troops would know their senior officers as well as the regimental officers. In every foreign army a brigadier is as well known to the men as a colonel is in the English Army. There is no possible means at the present moment of a brigadier being acquainted with his men. At the present moment, according to arrangements which are being made, I understand that there are to be permanent brigadiers, who are to appear at manœuvres. That will be the only time they will be with the men for any length of time. If we had units of brigades instead of Army Corps we should have a much sounder system by bringing the men into contact with the senior officers; and I hope something will be done in this direction.

What has been proved is that the training of our officers and men, especially the cavalry, was not satisfactory in the late war. No answer has been given to that, and no answer has been vouchsafed in reply to the question as to what will be done in the future for the training of our officers and men when they get into their regiments. There is to be nothing except a few more manœuvres; but that will not get over the difficulty. Something else will have to be done, and I hope that the debate will be prolonged until we get some definite answer on the subject. Let me point out another illustration. It is suggested that if the officer is to remain at Sandhurst for two years instead of one he will no doubt obtain a certain amount of technical training, but the fault is that it does him no good, and when he joins his regiment that technical training is forgotten. What will really happen is that when they get a regiment they will be trained to practice the theories they learned in school, and if their efforts are successful, and they show diligence, they will get promotion in the Service.

COLONEL SANDYS (Lancashire, Bootle): I do not propose to trouble the House much upon this subject, but there are a few practical remarks I should like to make upon it. Before doing so I should like to join in the unanimous opinion as to the excellent character of the scheme which the Secretary of State has laid before the House. It is a fitting corollary to the scheme for the organisation of the Army in which the only fault I venture to find is that the Army Corps is too large a unit, and a Division would have been better. But, with one exception, the scheme put forward to-day is a fitting corollary to the other. Perhaps another point with which I am not so agreed is the introduction of the University candidate into the Army. I have a very great respect for the learning of the Universities, but we must not in the training of the mind lose sight of the training of the muscle. After all, what is wanted for the groundwork and starting-point for the efficiency of an officer in the Army? First and foremost is strength; that must be followed by a fair average intelligence and education, and, thirdly, he must be a gentleman. They are the three postulates of an Army officer, and I am a little bit afraid that after the speech of one of the Members for Scotland, in his worship of the high culture of the University candidate, it is possible that chest measurement and biceps development may be lost sight of. A very important question was dealt with by the right hon. Gentleman in his reference to the treatment of the young officer after he had joined a battalion. I have always felt that in our Army we are under a disadvantage to other armies. A young officer having passed a certain examination is passed to a particular regiment. It occasionally happens that a young officer who had satisfied the examiners did not at all satisfy the officers of a particular regiment. They had to admit him into their family—a kind of patriarchal system of which the Colonel is the patriarch—and there were no means of getting rid of him when once enlisted, and therefore some of those scenes arose, which we all deplore, by which officers took means to rid themselves of individuals, which means are not to be defended. The right hon. Gentleman put forward a very right and proper way in which a case of that kind could be dealt with.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. and gallant Member is travelling beyond the range of the question of the training of officers.

COLONEL SANDYS: Of course it is most advisable that officers should be trained in the duties they have to carry out in the field, and I think, in the wise course proposed at Sandhurst, and also in the careful supervision of the very careful reports made upon officers during their professional career, we have a guarantee that they will not be allowed to be placed in a position of command unless they have shown themselves perfectly fit for it. With reference to the proposition of the Sandhurst cadet going into camp, I think a two years course is not too long to teach him what he has to know before he joins the service. I hope on an early occasion to have an opportunity of saying a good deal on the question of Army organisation.

*MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs): With respect to the weeding out of cadets, the right hon. Gentleman can more easily get rid of cadets who are not efficient in their duties as he increases the course at Sandhurst to two years. Another welcome proposal is that Militia officers should be trained for some months in Regular regiments, and a third is that University candidates should be trained with another corps instead of their own. It is very difficult to get rid of an officer once he has been commissioned; it would be much easier to get rid of him before. The hon. and learned Member for Haddington laid stress upon the mind of the Army. One ought to lay stress also upon the outside training in regimental life, and the necessity to provide adequate manœuvring grounds. I agree with the mover, the seconder, and the supporters of the proposal to maintain a large corps in South Africa, as a training ground, and in the abolition of the present system of linked battalions, if officers are to be trained, and, through them, their men.

*COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince): I have very great doubt whether University men would make good officers in times of peace; in war they are a very useful addition. They certainly would not improve the discipline of troops. Another point which has not occurred to the Secretary of State is the question of expense. The best officers are the sons of officers; for instance, Sir C. Napier, Lord Wolseley, Lord Roberts. I do not believe in this lengthy preparation. A good many men cannot afford to give university training to their children. I say the first reverse in South Africa was due to an invention, which gave a decisive tactical advantage to the Boers. It was practically the same thing as what occurred in the war of 1866 when, by the introduction of the breech-loader, the Austrians, with an army probably quite as good and quite as large as that of Prussia, was wiped out in seven weeks. That was solely owing to the decisive tactical advantage which the needle-gun gave to Prussia over Austria. In this case the same thing occurred, the modern rifle with the magazine and smokeless powder was able to protect the front——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is now dealing with questions which do not arise on this Motion, which is the training of officers.

*COLONEL BLUNDELL: Very well, Sir, I will not pursue it. I only wanted to show that we must be very careful not to pull our Army to pieces too much by mistaking the causes of its early reverses.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): Sir, I rise to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman upon the action he proposes to take. Those of us who have had anything to do with the training of our young men have complained mostly of the kind of military training which these young fellows have had to go through in order to get into Sandhurst; a system of training which gave rise to cramming which did no good whatever. My right hon. friend has changed all that; pedantic conundrums are not now to be put to the unfortunate victims, and, in addition, he is going to give, if I may call it so, scientific secondary education. The minds of these young men are to be directed more exclusively to their future profession, but even then the idea must come strongly back to our minds that the successful generals are born and not made; they turn up when the appropriate time comes. It is most significant that those who have been most scientifically trained in the staff college are not those who have distinguished themselves in after life. From the Return asked for by the hon. Member for King's Lynn, it appears that those who succeeded in life were not those who had had this expensive training in the staff college. I am glad to hear that the old fashion of close formation, the thin red line and other lines of old military training are to be done away with. Sir William Butler in his life of Sir George Colley, who was one of the greatest soldiers of his day, pointed out how essential it was that we should drop our old system of military training and try and imitate the Boers in this and other points by which the Boers very nearly beat us out of the field on one or two memorable occasions during the late war. My right hon. friend has done good service in altering that training.

The writer of those remarkable articles which appeared in *The Times* upon Army Reform said the description of certain senior officers who had been promoted and got considerable kudos in the late war was—

> "Great personal gallantry, intense dread of responsibility, agonising irresolution, utter lack of resource."

This list of characteristics would serve as a brief personal sketch of more than one senior officer who has gained promotion and distinguished notices in despatches. Thorough-going sense of personal responsibility is an essential reform. The only question I want to ask is whether the military authorities are sufficiently alive to the necessity of replacing the old-fashioned and obsolete manœuvres with manœuvres of a more practical kind, and more adapted to that condition of warfare which we have to meet in those small wars in which we are from time to time engaged.

COLONEL PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton): I am very sorry that the hon. and learned Member for Haddingtonshire did not elaborate sufficiently what he meant by the training of officers after they joined their regiments. It seems to me that that is really the crux of the whole question. It is the opinion in many quarters outside this House that young men are trained well up to the time they join their regiments. They get well instructed in every way, and a great deal of the Secretary of State's scheme provides for that. But what I ask him to consider, and consider very carefully, is whether he cannot remedy what I believe is a very general defect, namely, that after promising young men join their regiments many of them instead of improving, actually deteriorate. Their rate of progress before they join their regiments in military instruction and military matters generally is very much greater than afterwards—in fact, just as light is in contrast to darkness. It requires an exceedingly strong character in a young man to face the kind of influences to which he is subjected after he has joined the regiment. We all know—I think it is an open secret—that in a very great measure the amusements that belong to the military life, such as hunting, and polo, and so on, and other amusements that are not so improving as polo and hunting, come first. A man who can play polo well and can go straight across country, providing that he has the other qualifications of an officer, is a better officer for these accomplishments. But young officers ought to aim at more than that. They ought to improve their military knowledge and give full scope to the worthy ambition to improve in martial science. I do appeal to my right hon. friend to give his first consideration to this matter. Everybody knows it wants doing. From his achievements since he has occupied the post, the duties of which he has discharged in such a splendid manner, I am sure he is capable of remedying this defect, and there is no more worthy matter that can engage his attention. If he can once break up the system of putting pleasure first and duty afterwards among the officers of the Army, he will have accomplished one of the very highest reforms that ever an English War Minister effected. He has faced pretty big seas and I hope he will continue to face those seas successfully, and I only ask him to give this point his careful consideration.

Question put, and agreed to.

Main Question again proposed :

Debate arising.

VOLUNTEER ORGANISATION.

*MR. LAMBTON (Durham, S.E.): I believe I am in order in calling attention to the Amendment I have placed on the Paper, viz.—

> "That it is of high importance that the Volunteer system be further developed, and that the Volunteer organisation throughout the Empire be strengthened."

Perhaps it will be thought that Motions from this side of the House are getting rather monotonous, but that may be because the Opposition are somewhat inactive. The Amendment is not moved as a Vote of Censure on the Government or as an attack on the Secretary of State for War. I recognise the good the right hon. Gentleman has done to the Army, and all I ask is that he will consider the question to which the Amendment refers with an open mind. There are several of us on this side, who believe we came here for some purpose other than that of being mere Ministerial puppets for the mechanical endorsement of every official proposition. It is true we came here to support the Government, and we recognise their good intentions, but when we see them marching along a road paved with good intentions, we feel it our duty to help them occasionally by hoisting a danger board, or a signpost pointing to a better way. I take it that this Amendment has been recognised by the Government as something of that sort, because since it appeared on the Paper two interesting announcements have been made by the War Office—first, the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the state of the auxiliary forces, and secondly, the formation of a motor Volunteer corps, with a specially designed uniform. This shows that the Government is fully alive to the cause for anxiety with regard to the auxiliary forces, and also that they are quite up-to-date and imbued with the newest opinions on military equipment and improvement. I say, therefore, that this Amendment has received the seal of Ministerial approbation, and consequently I am certain it will receive the support of all loyal followers of the Government. The Government has practically blessed this Amendment; the genius of the War Office is hovering over it; I can almost feel the binding of red tape. It may be said that the promise of a Royal Commission renders discussion unnecessary. I think the contrary is the fact, and that it is most necessary that the House should discuss the Volunteer question before the Commission is appointed, because I have noticed that while Commissions are sitting there is usually a muzzling order in force in the House with regard to the discussion of the questions under their consideration; while, in addition, I have been told by a distinguished colonel that if we wait until the Royal Commission reports there will be no Volunteers left to report upon.

I should not have troubled the House with my views had it not fallen to my lot to do so. I do not pose as an expert. I have served in the Army and in the Volunteers, but I do not claim to have any knowledge worthy of the attention of the House; all I say is that I bring forward the Motion with a sincere desire to do what I can to serve the cause of the Volunteer force. Having served in both the Army and the Volunteers, I may say one thing, and that is that there is an *esprit de corps* in both which is sometimes not appreciated in high places. There are two facts which ought to be taken into consideration when we come to deal with this question. In the first place very few civilians understand soldiers, and very few soldiers understand Volunteers. I think I shall only need to refer to some of the Army Orders to prove this. This Resolution of mine I think is both concise and comprehensive. It is comprehensive because it includes the Volunteers of the Empire; it is concise because it is intended to lay down three principles—firstly, that this question is an important and urgent matter and ought to be discussed by the House; secondly, that it wants development; and thirdly, that the organisation should be strengthened throughout the Empire. I propose to deal with the first two points, and leave the third to the hon. Member for Gravesend. The first proposition I will deal with is whether this force is an important and urgent matter now. I think if we bear in mind what the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for War said in the debate on the Army Corps Scheme, we must recognise that they attach great importance to this Volunteer system. I think they do take the Volunteers seriously, and I know that the Volunteers take themselves seriously. I believe that that is the view of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War.

I will now ask the House to consider the Army order passed on the 24th December, 1901, an order which was issued by the War Office, signed by the Commander-in-Chief, and which had the approbation of the Secretary of State for War. In that order the Volunteers are asked if they wish to be taken seriously. That question is a proof that very few soldiers understand Volunteers. Perhaps I had better read the words of the order, which are as follows—

> "For some years past the Volunteer force has constantly claimed to be seriously accepted as a reliable and organised section of the Army for home defence. It is now determined that the responsibility claimed shall be realised."

I take it that this order was an unmerited insult to the Volunteer force, and could not conduce to its efficiency. It is an order which cannot increase the efficiency of the Volunteer force, and considering the date at which it is published there is no justification whatever for such an order. The right hon. Gentleman and the Prime Minister do take the Volunteers seriously. I am quite certain that the country took them seriously a short time ago during the war; and to complain now that they are not taken seriously, and that they require to do something else in order to be taken seriously after what they did in South Africa, is a most extraordinary piece of red tape. It should not be forgotten that the Volunteers sent out 594 officers, 26,082 men, and 6,902 Yeomanry, and thousands were left at home ready to do anything the War Office asked them to do. And after all this they are asked if they wish to be taken seriously! What has the War Office ever done to take them seriously? The lines of invasion in this country are perfectly well known to all military men, but has anything ever been done to put the Volunteers on those lines, or have they ever been afforded facilities for obtaining any practical knowledge of taking up positions on those lines of invasion. I would ask the right hon. Gentleman if it is not a fact that the Volunteers are not even under the Manœuvre Act, so that it is impossible for the Volunteers to be afforded such facilities? I have the honour to be the colonel of the Volunteer battalion which went all the way from Northumberland to Salisbury Plain for fourteen days, and they numbered nearly 800 strong, and were paid Army rates. When men are found willing to go out to South Africa in such vast numbers, and when they are found willing to journey from Northumberland to Salisbury Plain, I think they have no right to be asked if they wish to be taken seriously; and therefore I ask this House now, by endorsing the views I have put forward, to show the country that the House of Commons at any rate takes them seriously. I think this should be announced to the country, and do not let us have any more humbug about it. If we do not believe in the Volunteers let us say so; if we do believe in them let the House of Commons tell them so.

My next point is the question of the system and its development. At the present time there is a new Army Scheme, which I may call the Army Corps Scheme, which has only lately been born, and is still in swaddling-clothes. We are told on high and grave authority that on the 1st of April this scheme will become more active. Within the last few days something has happened which shows an extraordinary state of things, and that is the appointment of this Royal Commission to inquire into the condition of the Volunteer forces, and this has been appointed two years after the conception of the Army Corps Scheme. Is this not an extraordinary admission? The Prime Minister and the right hon. Gentleman said that the fulfilment of the scheme depended upon the auxiliary forces. And now, two years after the scheme was initiated, a Royal Commission is appointed to inquire into the very foundation on which the Army Scheme rests. What should we say of the architect who designed a house without first considering his foundation, or of the builder who used stone from a quarry that had never been tested? And yet the right hon. Gentleman has been building away for two years, and is only now beginning to examine his foundations when he ought to be putting on the roof.

The success of the scheme depends on the stability of the Volunteer force, and I am afraid it can be shown that the Volunteer force, which is one of the corner stones of the structure, is tottering, and will before long collapse. As to the strength of the Volunteers at present, the full establishment of officers is 9,409, and there is a deficiency of 2,147; the establishment of all ranks is 346,000, and there is a deficiency of 96,000. I believe this deficiency is increasing daily, and what it will be in a few months it is very difficult to say. Surely these are very serious figures. The climax, or rather I should say the bathos, of the deficiency will not be reached until 1st November, 1904, when the new regulations as to camp attendance come into force. By that time—I do not wish to exaggerate—it is perfectly impossible to calculate what the deficiency of officers and men may be. There are some authorities who think that the Volunteers will have practically ceased to exist. What is the cause of this diminution? I may be told that it is the reaction after the war, and that there was certain to be a falling off in the recruiting. I congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on the success of his Yeomanry scheme. Although the Volunteer force is decreasing, the new Yeomanry force is increasing in a satisfactory manner. That force has now reached 24,000. I may be told that it is owing to the new requirements of efficiency; I say that it is because you have altered the whole spirit of the Volunteer Act. This has been done without discussion in this House.

Under the Act of 1863, which established the Volunteer force, it was laid down that all Orders in Council should be laid before both Houses of Parliament for one month. I have no doubt that has been done, but at a time when the House was unable to discuss the alterations. At all events, it is a fact that the House has not discussed these Orders in Council. I believe it was not possible for officers commanding Volunteer corps to obtain copies of these Orders in Council in order that they might communicate with Members of Parliament with the view to having a discussion before the alterations were made. The new regulations have placed the Volunteer force entirely at the mercy of the Secretary of State for War. The Secretary of State may now make what orders he pleases as to the efficiency of the Volunteer force. I may say that I am profoundly convinced that the objections of the Volunteer force to the new regulations are not military. The original intention was that the Volunteers should train themselves in their own time, and that they should make themselves as efficient soldiers as they possibly could. What is the case now? You have made training compulsory, and the whole system is altered without reference to Parliament. I believe this compulsory system is doing away with the spirit of the Volunteer force. The Volunteers do not object to do all they can under the new conditions to make themselves efficient, but they say it is physically impossible for them to give the time which the regulations require. The attendances at camps under the new regulations are entirely different from what they were in the past. In the old days camps used to be held generally in holiday time. Now it is a fixed time, and it is absolutely impossible for men to devote time to the Volunteer force when they are dependent on weekly wages. Most of them in the country are working men; they receive nothing during their week in camp. It is impossible for employers in every case to give them leave of absence, but even if employers gave them leave, the men, and more particularly married men, cannot afford to spend a week in camp. Every man is not able to go into camp at the time asked for by the War Office. There are men who are themselves willing to join the Volunteer force, but they receive opposition at home from their wives and families. That is a great deterrent to recruiting. If the attendance in camps and the regulations issued by the War Office are unpopular, the recruiting of the Volunteer force must fail, as it is now failing.

There is another question of the utmost importance to Volunteers, namely, shooting practice. With most working men this must be done out of their working hours, because the ranges are so far from the places where they live. They often complain of the hard and fast rules which are now made, and they believe that those regulations might easily be relaxed at the discretion of commanding officers. They are willing to comply with the regulations as far as they can, but in many cases the conditions imposed by the War Office are impossible. May I say a word about the finances of the officers? It is calculated that the deficiency will be so great that in a year's time, or perhaps a little more, some of the officers will be on the verge of bankruptcy. They are responsible in many cases for the property of their corps, such as drill halls and ranges. This is a great deterrent to Volunteer officers joining the force. Self-respecting men, not millionaires, will not join if they are to be made financially responsible for all those things, the cost of which they cannot calculate. The officers are going, and the men are going. Is it possible to remove the causes? I will make some suggestions to show that I think we could. We ought to abandon compulsory camps or pay the men while they are in camp. Many men who are well trained and good shots cannot go into camp under these fixed regulations. Then the Government should buy more rifle ranges. Many ranges are being closed all over the country. The Government should also supply ammunition more freely and allow greater elasticity in the regulations for class-firing. They expect too much from the recruits and the first and second year men. I think it would be much better to keep these men at short ranges until they become good marksmen. If you get a good marksman let him fire at extended ranges and vanishing targets, but it is wasting ammunition and the time of marksmen to ask them to begin class-firing over again every year from the beginning.

As to the officers, I will go so far as to say that I would abandon the capitation grant and give a grant per unit. Volunteer officers should not depend on mere numbers to obtain their finances. Under the present system some of the men induced to join are not desirable in the Service, and they would be got rid of under the proposal I make. At the same time you do not want to reduce the numbers, for I think we should have as many men as possible in the Volunteer force, although the War Office does not seem to think so. On 24th December, 1901, the War Office issued an Army order in which they say—

> "It is fully realised that the civil occupation of some Volunteers will not admit of their complying with the minimum conditions necessary for an effective course of military training, and that consequently the force must ultimately lose the services of such men."

And then the order goes on to say—

> "It is preferable to have a somewhat smaller number of more highly trained officers and men, sufficient to meet all the demands for home defence."

I do not believe that the proposition laid down in that Army order is sound. The numbers of Volunteers may be reduced and a high efficiency be secured, but will the efficiency of the men who remain be so great as to be worth while? We want as many men as possible to go through the ranks with some training, and if there were a necessity for a call on their services there would be three weeks or a month in which they could be trained before they were summoned into the field. The Reserves which were called up to go to

South Africa had to be trained again, and had to spend some time in the performance of military operations before they were sent to the front. I suggest that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War should extend the excellent proposal he has made of an Advisory Board of Volunteer Officers, and that he should create a special department for the Auxiliary forces.

It may be said that these proposals which I have hurriedly sketched would be expensive and increase the Estimates. I do not want to see the Estimates increased, and I do not believe that it is really necessary. It must be acknowledged that the Volunteer force is at present a very cheap force. The Volunteers cost £6 2s. 6d. per head; the ordinary soldiers of the Regular Army cost £84 per head; the Militia about £19 6s. per head; and the Yeomanry about £20 8s. per head. Will it not be possible to save on the Regular Army, by reducing it by a certain number of men, sufficient to maintain a larger number of Volunteers than we have at present, and even keep these in a state of efficiency? I will go further. A Royal Commission has been appointed to inquire into the Volunteer force. The Army Corps Scheme has been sanctioned. I ask the Government to go to a logical conclusion and withdraw the Orders in Council to which the Volunteers object. Let them wait till the Royal Commission has reported, and meantime go back to the *status quo ante.* That will be far better than to go on with these regulations, to which so much objection has been taken. I am sorry to have detained the House so long; but I have endeavoured to show that this is an important matter which demands the attention of Parliament, and that under the original Act of 1863 it was intended by Parliament that the Volunteers should be an entirely voluntary force, and that there should be no compulsion about it. I maintain that compulsion has been introduced, and that it is the duty of this House to remove it. I think it is of the highest importance that we should be unanimous in this matter, because if the House unanimously agrees to urge on the Government some reform of the present system it will show that we really believe in this Volunteer force, and that it is a force well worth keeping, not only because of its material strength, but also because of the spirit it has introduced, and the influence it has exercised on the national character. If we once destroy this system of a purely Volunteer force, and introduce conscription or compulsion, we shall destroy one of the greatest supports this country possesses. Whatever reliance may be placed on our ships, our men, and our wealth, we should place still greater reliance on the spirit of the nation, and I say that it is the duty of this House to be the guardian and upholder of the character of our people.

*Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I do not rise for the purpose of attacking, but rather of appealing to the Government to translate their constantly avowed sympathy with the Volunteer movement into a direct contribution, a direct gift of independence, apart from the Regular Army—a position and a character of their own. I believe that late events have shown that the Government, although they may not have wished it, have confused the principles of dealing with the Volunteers. The Resolution which my hon. friend has moved is that the Volunteer system should be further developed, and that the organisation of Volunteers throughout the Empire should be strengthened. I am aware that those who have taken part in debates on Army reform in this House have been accused of personal feeling. I do not believe that the Government or any Member of this House will believe that in anything I may say on this subject I am actuated by any other feeling than the best interests of the Volunteer system. In relation to this I may say that the Minister for War, on the 8th of March, 1901, said that the main amount of interference with military matters was caused by civilians in the House of Commons itself. The Volunteers are composed of civilians, and the chief political expert in the House of Commons who represents the country at the War Office, is a civilian. I do not think there is anything occult in the working of the Department or in military knowledge; and I do not think that the House would have us hold our peace, if we feel very strongly, lest in the great national séance we should disturb the planchette which brings into existence martial phantoms for the arid plains of Salisbury and the humid heights of Edinburgh Castle. May I ask what is an expert? Is not an expert a man who knows what to do, and how to do it? And in that position the Minister of War is classed. He is the man who should know what to do, and his professional advisers are those who should show him how to do it.

I have two propositions to make, and they are these—firstly, that the Volunteer system as it stands, and as dealt with by the Minister for War, stands or falls with his Army Corps system; and secondly, that the Volunteer system, as it is, represents a confusion of principles. That confusion of principles I believe to be due to the fact that when the war machine was working at its highest pressure, and at a time when the War Minister and all its officials were intensely applying themselves to the great difficulties of the situation, the War Minister brought in a scheme for the reform of the Regular Army, and added to it the reform of the Volunteer system by attaching it to the Army Corps, which were to serve the country for home defence when needed, to be sent abroad in time of trouble, to garrison India and our coaling stations, and also to provide an expeditionary force. The War Minister saw safety in a larger Army and a fitter Army; and I honestly believe that he tried to give us both. That he has not succeeded I believe to be due to the fact that he was in too great a hurry, and that, as the country was crying out for something new, he thought he had grasped the principle of the thing necessary, and gave it to the country. We asked for reform, and he gave us expansion. We asked for radical treatment of the Army, and he did not give us radical treatment. He did not dig to the roots; he engrafted on the branches; and now I honestly believe we have the same old shrivelled tree, and the same old shrivelled fruit. He has linked the Volunteers up with the Regulars, and I believe that the linking up of the Regulars and Volunteers in the Army Corps will not work; and that the new regulations have not worked is shown, I submit, by the fact that at the present moment a Royal Commission has been appointed to deal with the protests, the anxiety, and the trouble which has been caused in the Volunteer system by these regulations. What have they done? They have depleted the force, on the authority of the Minister of War himself, by 35,000 men. Others, who are competent to know, say that they have depleted the force by 65,000 or 70,000 men.

The Minister of War said on Thursday last the diminution of officers in 1901 was only 1½ per cent. more than in 1896.† He pointed out that the diminution had been going on for twenty years, and I ask, if the War Minister knew that the depletions had been going on for twenty years at the time he brought in his Army reform scheme why he imposed these regulations? It seems to me that he recognised the fact that the art of efficiency was difficult, and he was determined to make it impossible.

*MR. BRODRICK: No, no.

*SIR GILBERT PARKER: I do not say he was determined to make it impossible in the sense that the War Minister accepts my statement. But he imposed regulations which I believe were not sufficiently considered. Those regulations have not proved successful and a Royal Commission has been appointed. That is a failure, I admit, but I welcome it with a fearful kind of joy. It is designed to kill agitation in the healing springs of time. I believe that is the object in appointing a Royal Commission at the present moment. I do not suggest it is not justifiable under the circumstances, and I wish to say I believe that the appointment of this Royal Commission is intended to deal with the inefficacy of the old regulations and the grievance of the Volunteers. But this appointment proves that the great reform scheme has broken down as far as the Volunteers are concerned. Our Volunteer force is, or is not, a vital part of our defence. If it is not, why include it in the Army reform scheme?

*MR. BRODRICK: The Volunteer units of the Army Corps have already taken their places, and are pronounced efficient for the purpose of Volunteer officers.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxviii., 1555.

*Sir GILBERT PARKER: My argument is not affected by the statement of the War Minister. I shall put forward a proposition, presently, to deal with this point. What is the truth about this? The new regulations have broken down in many quarters. My hon. friend showed that the compulsory camps have not worked, and will not work, successfully; that the musketry regulations are too severe; that we have not ranges sufficiently convenient for practice; that we have not control over them for permanent ranges, nor are they near enough to the Metropolis for the accommodation of metropolitan corps. The chief objectors to the regulations have been, I admit, the Metropolitan Corps, but surely they are a very important factor in the whole scheme of Volunteer organisation. My hon. friend also suggests there is an insufficiency of ammunition, and I do not believe there is a Volunteer officer in the Metropolitan area who will not say the same thing. He cannot bring his men to a proper state of efficiency, particularly those who wish to perfect themselves, with the limited amount of ammunition given at the present time, and if he supplements that amount it has to be paid for either by the commanding officer himself, or those who hold themselves responsible for him. Now, on the point of the education of officers, I will not submit any remark except that I think it will be a step in the right direction if Volunteer officers can attend the garrison classes free. I believe there are many Volunteer officers who feel it a very difficult matter indeed, whatever their enthusiasm may be, to pay what is practically fifty or sixty guineas for completing their course.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): They have their pay.

*Sir GILBERT PARKER: Yes; but they do not receive pay adequate for these classes. But let us suppose that the Royal Commission will set this right. I again repeat that a full scheme of defence represents confusion of principles. Now, we have the six Army Corps; the first at Aldershot; the second at Salisbury; the third in Ireland; and the fourth at Colchester. The Minister of War said these would be under a commander who would lead them in war, and that his object was to centralise responsibility and decentralise administration.

And, it being half-past Seven of the Clock, the Debate stood adjourned till This Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY (ARMY ESTIMATES).

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on main question [9th March], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Main Question again proposed. Debate resumed.

*Sir GILBERT PARKER: I am afraid I gave my hon. friend the hon. Baronet the Member for Sheffield an erroneous view of what I meant when I said the education of the Volunteer officers cost as much as £60. I did not mean the ordinary examinations followed by the examinations for drill certificates cost that. I meant, of course, the superior education of the Volunteer officers in the higher branches of their profession represented by what is known as the "2" certificate. I venture to say in connection with that Volunteer officers have made most remarkable progress. Probably 90 per cent. of these certificates are held by Volunteer officers. The natural enthusiasm of Volunteer officers has impelled them, so far as lies in their power, to make themselves more efficient, and I am one of those who believe that if opportunities are opened to them for greater usefulness they will take full advantage of those opportunities. I am afraid it is possible that in the exigencies of debate I may, perhaps, have given the impression that I have not a very great admiration for the energy, enthusiasm, courage and extraordinary industry of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War. On the contrary, so far as his conduct of the war was concerned; so far as his administrative work is concerned; and his loyalty and patriotism is translated into constant and efficient work during the progress of that great war, I express the deepest admiration and the strongest belief in the efficiency of his labours at the War Office. But the point on which I differ from him is that his Army Corps Scheme includes a responsibility on the part of the Volunteers, and also on the part of the Regulars towards the Volunteers, in the construction of the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Army Corps, and so far as the Second Army Corps is concerned the Volunteer district is included for military purposes.

My point is that in time of war, when a stress is laid on the Regular forces of this country, what will become of the organisation? I should like to know if the Regular forces of the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Army Corps will not be withdrawn from those Army Corps and sent to wherever the scene of action may be abroad. I am afraid my right hon. friend may say that that is possible; but if that is so I wish to ask where is the organisation? The First Lord of the Treasury said in one of his speeches on this question in the House that the Regulars were only intended as a stiffening and support to the Volunteer forces in those Army Corps, but if you take away from those Army Corps the brain, which is the general commanding and the staff, and take away the backbone which, as we are told, is the Regulars, what becomes of the organisation? Is it not reasonable to suppose if war breaks out tomorrow, or next year. that Sir Archibald Hunter would be called upon to take command of forces which were sent abroad of the First, Second, and Third Army Corps, and if that is the case what then becomes of the organisation, and staff, and the command of that Army Corps he is supposed to represent? It may be that the reply to these questions I am asking is obvious, but it seems to me that a great number of Members of this House would like a reply. I do not know that I am alone in finding some confusion of principle in this aspect of the case.

I said in the commencement of my speech there was a question of the confusion of principle, and I suggest when during last session the Military and Yeomanry Bill was brought in, that confusion of principle occurred when the Yeomanry were asked for pay or reward to set themselves apart for service abroad. That was an evasion of the Volunteer principle as most of us understand it. They cease to be Volunteers when they are ear-marked to go abroad in time of war. They then become a kind of Regular force employed only during a portion of their years of service. This question perplexes me. Perhaps I may be a little obtuse, but I represent a constituency which asks these questions, and the responsibility rests with my right hon. friend to give the information. I suggest the ear-marking of the Militia, who are part of the Volunteer home defence Army, for service abroad, whether by contract or for higher pay, makes them cease to be Volunteers in the strict sense of the term, and they become an irregular portion of a Regular force. I would ask my right hon. friend if this is the view of the Government of this country: that you can combine the Regulars and the Volunteers, and at the same time preserve a proper balance of power. My right hon. friend, I assume, thinks we can; I believe we cannot. I believe these forces should be kept distinct, so far as organisation is concerned. I am not so foolish as to suggest that the influence and example of training with the Regular Army would not be an advantage which the Volunteers of this country might well take. My only object is to present this possible solution: Whether our Volunteer service cannot be kept apart for home defence, whilst our Regular Army is kept for garrisoning India and our coaling stations, and for such expeditionary services abroad as occur from time to time. Our expeditionary services during the last seventy years, including one or two great wars, have amounted to ninety, and I submit to the House, whether it is not reasonable to ask the consideration of the Government as to whether they cannot organise the Volunteer forces upon a basis on which they will be responsible for the defence of their country, and they alone. I shall probably be told that that is impossible, that you cannot organise the Volunteer forces for home defence, but while I await the answer of my right hon. friend, I may point out, that in his speech the other day, the First Lord of the Treasury said we would have to depend in time of war for the defence of this country on the citizen Army.

*MR. BRODRICK: Mainly.

*SIR GILBERT PARKER: Mainly on our citizen Army. I submit if that be the case there may come a time when under great stress we shall have to depend wholly on our citizen Army. If we are not prepared for that emergency, what will be the condition of this country? I would like to quote one of my right hon. friend's own speeches in respect to that. In 1901, when he brought in his scheme he said—

> "The first three Army Corps are intended for foreign service, but, of course, for home defence in the first instance."

What are we to assume from that? By placing these three Army Corps at these particular stations, we shall have them not merely in the best possible positions for the defence of this country, but also in the best possible places for embarkation. The three Army Corps are for foreign service but for home defence in the first instance; but what is the second instance? It is, I presume, that in the time of a great war it is possible that such may be the exigencies of the war that our Regulars to the last man ought to go abroad. If that be the case it seems to me we have the condition of things I wish to present. We have to trust the home defence to the citizen Army. Our case is that you cannot do this without organising the Volunteers to cover the whole ground of home defence. Cannot we then have a separate department? There is not a Volunteer officer who has not had to lament, at some time or other, the red tape and the constant delay that has occurred in dealing with cases he has had to present to the War Office. Of course I am not blaming my right hon. friend or the officials for this; I believe it to be entirely the fault of the system. I believe the Volunteers of this country should have a separate department of their own, within and under the control of the War Office.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): You have got it.

*SIR GILBERT PARKER: I do not think the evidence is such that we can say we have got a separate department in the War Office for the Volunteers.

LORD STANLEY: What is the Inspector General of Auxiliary Forces?

*SIR GILBERT PARKER: An officer who has a duty to perform so far as inspection is concerned, but as to any scheme of organisation within the War Office for the control of the Militia, Yeomanry and Volunteers of this country—my right hon. friend smiles.

*MR. BRODRICK: I was only smiling at the idea of having two War Offices instead of one.

*SIR GILBERT PARKER: No, I am of opinion that one is enough. What I am suggesting is that my right hon. friend shall have none of his authority degraded or depreciated; that the War Office shall still have its place in the administration of this country, but that the officials who have to do the work of the Volunteer forces of this country, and what I call the Home Defence Army, should be set apart from top to bottom from the rest of the Department, and I believe this, that if that were done the work the Volunteer officers ask to have done would be done more promptly.

Now I want to present another aspect of the case. I want to suggest that this confusion of principle to which I have alluded was apparent to my right hon. friend when he attended the Colonial Conference. When my right hon. friend brought down his Army Reform Scheme it was called an Imperial Defence Scheme, and the First Lord of the Treasury speaking of this scheme in this House called it an Imperial Defence Scheme. Within the boundaries of that scheme my right hon. friend had a proposition to make to the colonies, and he made it with his accustomed force and ability. I wonder whether he was surprised at the response to his proposition at the Colonial Conference. I confess I was not. Two months before the subject was discussed at the Conference in the columns of *The Times* there appeared several alternatives whereby the colonies might be invited to contribute to the Imperial defence, so far as the Army was concerned. When these alternatives were presented I watched for replies, and I was not disappointed. There came from the Premiers of Australia and Canada, through the columns of *The Times*, this statement:—

> "This looks like taxation without representaion. The colonies will give, and give liberally, or the defence of their own soil, whether it be y naval or military force."

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I do not see how the question of whether the colonies should contribute is a matter which rises on the Estimates.

* SIR GILBERT PARKER: I bow to your ruling, Sir; I was perhaps going out of my way somewhat, but I was trying to arrive at this point, that the right hon. Gentleman, in making these proposals to the Colonial Conference, was making proposals which were not compatible with the scheme of Imperial Defence. The right hon. Gentleman suggested that there should be drawn from what he called the permanent forces of Canada and Australia one man out of every four to be set apart for Imperial service. I believe the principle is bad, and I believe it can only be applied to the colonies so far as their contributions to the Regular forces of this country are concerned. I likewise believe that if we can have a citizen army in this country, with its own department, and with its proper equipment, with duties which it would understand, of great national responsibility, that there would be no difficulty in getting the colonies to approximate to the standard set up by the military authorities of this country, and you would never need to fear, on the part of the colonies, an unwillingness to contribute in a form suitable to the democratic spirit of their democratic communities. I submit to this House that these communities are essentially democratic. I submit also that this country in the stress of modern commercial and industrial competition, views with great alarm any increase of the military establishment of the nation. I submit to this House that the people of this country wish to have established

the very minimum of forces with the maximum of efficiency, and upon that basis, and upon that basis only, I believe will the people of this country tolerate the heavy military expenditure which even then will be needed. I also believe that if you appeal to the people of this country, on the basis of a citizen Army, which can be and will be made efficient, providing you give it proper opportunities for development, they will contribute freely and will not complain of the taxation that will have to be imposed. Such an army would cost but one-sixth or one-seventh that the same number of Regulars would cost. I believe that Lord Wolseley spoke the opinion of this country when he said that the time may come when the safety of the country will depend on the ability of every citizen to use his rifle.

* MR. BRODRICK: He did not say that we could do without Regulars.

*SIR GILBERT PARKER: No; neither do I advocate doing without Regulars, and the right hon. gentleman ought not to place any such interpretation on my remarks. I wish to say, in conclusion, that what I am asking for is the minimum of Regular forces required for our actual commitments abroad, in India and in the colonies, and to provide for the exigencies of expeditionary wars. At the same time I make this appeal to the right hon. Gentleman—to consider whether the growing feeling of this country concerning a citizen Army is not one which he should reckon with and readily foster. I ask him if it is not possible to work on the sentiment of character, and also on the sentiment of ambition, to give a proper national responsibility to the people who, I am sure, would rise to the needs of the situation and give that efficiency which the hon. Gentleman has asked for, but has not been obtained in the past, chiefly through the oppressive nature of the regulations and the lack of encouragement. If my right hon. friend and the Government of this country will only give consideration to this element in the life of this country, it will make for the defence of the soil and for the glory of our arms in times of danger as well as of in times of peace.

* MR. C. R. SPENCER (Northamptonshire, Mid.): I do not rise to weary the House with many remarks, but I wish to say one or two words on a matter which deserves the attention of hon. Members and of the Minister for War. The hon. Member who moved the Resolution used an expression which I think cannot be too strongly insisted upon, viz. that soldiers do not altogether understand the Volunteers and the Volunteer system. In that I entirely concur. I can understand its being very difficult for a soldier to see the Volunteer battalions working, to note the mistakes they make, and at the same time to realise the difficulties under which those battalions are constantly labouring. I think another remark of the hon. Member also deserves great attention at the hands of the authorities of the War Office, viz. that we must not forget the civilian character of the Volunteer force. I quite agree that there must be a certain amount of efficiency demanded from all Volunteer corps throughout the country. But I will ask the War Minister not to ask too much from them, for, however willing they be, they may not be able to pass in the same category as those who have greater facilities for military instruction. We do not wish to be pampered, or treated like spoilt children, but we do wish to feel that our difficulties are appreciated by the War Office. We wish to be treated with some sympathy when we may not come up to the standard which the War Office wishes us to reach. There must be a certain amount of elasticity given to the Volunteer forces, because in the case of some corps the facilities for bringing them up to the requirements of the War Office are very lacking indeed. It is hard for corps in country districts to reach the high level which is arrived at by Metropolitan corps, who have the advantage of drill halls and good shooting facilities. Take the new regulation dealing with musketry. I hope that some modification may be made to meet the conditions which I, for one, know to exist in many places. There is another difficulty, that of getting the men who live at some distance from the range to the range, because they have to lose a day's work, which they do not care to do. It really is disheartening at times, when one is trying to meet the expenditure of country battalions, to feel that there is a cut-and-dried rule by which we are bound, or otherwise we shall be treated as inefficient and fail to get the grant. The question of the provision of ranges is by no means an easy one. I myself have suffered acutely from murdered cows and sheep who wandered aimlessly across the ranges, and although they have died of hydrocephalus I have had to pay for them on the plea that they have been shot.

I think that the country will regret if the Volunteer forces should be materially diminished or ever become extinct. May I venture to suggest that as our expenses sometimes fall too heavily upon us, some portion of the money which is to be found for the provision of Army Corps might with great advantage be devoted to the Volunteer force. I carefully abstain from indicating which Army Corps might be done away with, but I do think that if the sum of money which it is proposed to devote to one of them were given to the Volunteers, the country would not regret it, and it would certainly obtain as much advantage from the expenditure of it in that direction as it would if it were allowed to go to its original destination. The Volunteer force is a source of great strength to this country, and I hope most sincerely that as time goes on, and when the War Office has had more opportunity of inquiring into its requirements and necessities, we shall be placed in a more favourable position than we now are. I believe that the Inspector General of Auxiliary Forces is animated by a passionate desire to help those forces, but he is debarred doing all he wishes—not only by the lack of money, but by the stress of work at the War Office. I would ask the Minister of War not to make the conditions of the Volunteer service so severe that men, panting to do their best to fulfil the requirements laid down by the War Office, are made to feel that though they have done their utmost they have failed owing to the fact that the War Office seems to be regardless of their interests and ignorant of the necessities that arise from the fact that after all they are civilians.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I thank my hon. friend the Member for South-East Durham for calling attention this afternoon to this matter, and for having gone so fully and thoroughly into the details. The interest of this House in the Volunteer force must have been fully brought home to those who have been present during the debate, as well as, I hope, to the Leader of the House. Of course, the debate has been deprived of a great deal of interest that would otherwise have attached to it by the announcement of the right hon. Gentleman of his intention to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the question of the auxiliary forces. I venture to hope, in reference to that Commission, that care will be taken that it will not be too large to deal with the matter as thoroughly and as rapidly as possible. It cannot be denied that the Volunteer force have, until recently and during the last forty years, suffered much at the hands of the War Office. The force has triumphed over a great many difficulties. My hon. friends, the mover and seconder of this Resolution, called special attention to the regulations issued at the end of the year 1901. I am sure that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War will be the first to admit that those regulations were too hastily issued and were insufficiently considered, indeed we have a recognition of this state of affairs in the fact of his appointing a Committee under the active chairmanship of the Financial Secretary for the War Office, and including representatives of the Volunteer force, to go thoroughly and fully into these regulations. Contrary to the custom of many Committees, this Committee has sat *de die in diem* and it has produced an *ad interim* Report, upon which the Secretary for War quickly acted, with the result that a great deal of the sting of the new regulations has been taken away. At the same time, nothing can excuse the language in which those regulations was issued. My hon. friend the Member for South-East Durham read an extract which was peculiarly offensive to the Volunteer force. It is incontestable that these regulations have had a very large influence indeed in bringing about the present very serious state of affairs, and I am quite sure that my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War is as much concerned as every Member of this House to see the very large diminution which has lately taken place in the strength of the Volunteer force.

There may be some quibble as to figures, but it cannot be denied that during the war the numbers of the Volunteer force rose to 306,000, while at the latest date for which returns have been obtained it had fallen to 250,000. My right hon. friend stated that the diminution was largely owing to the cessation of war. I agree that that had something to do with it, but, at the same time, I think it would have been easy to retain the services of a large number of these men. The country, I am sure, was most undesirous of seeing the Volunteer forces reduced because the war had come to an end, but the cessation of war had not nearly as much effect in bringing about this result as the new regulations had. I believe my right hon. friend is anxious to redeem the mistakes which have undoubtedly been committed. He has shown this by appointing a Committee to modify the regulations. Still, some of the remaining regulations are extremely onerous. Compulsory camps are very difficult indeed to carry out. The Commander-in-Chief this year has given very considerable facilities in this matter by allowing camps to be held at different times, and by permitting men to be attached to regiments in the Regular Army. But I think there is a great deal in what has been said as to the necessity for more elasticity in the administration of the Volunteer force. It is quite impossible, for instance, for a country corps to do what strong metropolitan corps are able to accomplish. In the latter the men and officers are constantly together, and there is not the same necessity for them to spend the time in camp which there is in the case of country corps, the companies of which are widely scattered and have very few opportunities of assembling for battalion drill and training.

There was one matter mentioned by the hon. Member for Gravesend with which I agree. He referred to the necessity for some Department of the War Office which should have the control of the auxiliary forces. It is quite true that there is a high officer, the Inspector-General of Auxiliary Forces. I have known fifteen or twenty of these during my time, and they have proved as sympathetic as possible towards the force —none more so than the present Inspector-General. But he occupies a room exactly the size of the table in front of Mr. Speaker, and in that room he has, without any organisation, to control a force of Volunteers and Militia numbering upwards of 370,000. Surely an organisation like that is entitled to more accommodation at headquarters. We have often pressed on Secretaries for War that the Volunteers and Militia are entitled to representation on the Headquarter Staff of the Army. However sympathetic the Inspector-General may be it must be remembered that he has never served in the Volunteers. These Inspector-Generals are appointed direct from the Regular Army. It takes them a long time to acquaint themselves with the methods of the Auxiliary forces, and they are frequently removed from their posts before they have accomplished that end. Now the Yeomanry have a direct representative in the person of the Inspector-General of the Imperial Yeomanry. Lord Chesham is a Yeomanry officer, and he has a staff composed of officers drawn from the Imperial Yeomanry. It has been recognised in the case of the Yeomanry, and ought to be recognised in the case of the Militia and Volunteers. But my right hon. friend will say he is going to appoint a Council of Advice.

*MR. BRODRICK: It has been appointed.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I cannot say that I have seen anything of it. I do not know who has been appointed, and it has not been very active up to the present. It will no doubt do some good, but the Militia and Volunteers, who contribute so large a number of men to the defensive forces of the country, are entitled to a more adequate representation on the Headquarters Staff of the Army. These are matters which, among other things, I hope will be inquired into by the Royal Commission.

On the financial question I recognise to the full the generosity of my right hon. friend. He has been extremely generous in camp allowances; I have nothing whatever to complain of on that head, although I should be the first to complain, if necessary, because the responsibility for any deficit will fall on the shoulders of the individual commanding officer. In this connection I must take exception to the observation of my hon. friend the Member for Gravesend that the attachment of Volunteer corps to the Army Corps is not working satisfactorily.

*SIR GILBERT PARKER: I said it would not work satisfactorily.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: At any rate, it is working satisfactorily. I know personally that the regiment to which I belong is attached to the Fourth Army Corps, and that since the war it has been twice out for a fortnight's training, and has had no difficulty as regards money, and very little as regards numbers.

*SIR GILBERT PARKER: What I wished to convey was not that the Volunteers would not work with the Regulars in training, but that the organisation would not stand the test in the future.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I have no means of speaking as to the future; perhaps my hon. friend has. I can only say that up to the present we have had no difficulty; the scheme has worked satisfactorily as far as it goes. But I have some fault to find with regard to the selection of Volunteer battalions for the Army Corps. It is entirely dependent on their being able to find a specified number of men in a given fortnight. It is right to have a high standard of efficiency, but how a regiment attains that standard is not a matter of much concern. I do not think the mere fact of being able, by means of a bounty or otherwise, to provide a specified number of men in a given fortnight is an adequate test of the efficiency required. At all events, it presses very heavily on some corps. There is a great difference between corps, and this matter materially augments the difficulty of finding officers. The deficiency of Volunteer officers two or three years ago was 1,200 or 1,300; it is now upwards of 2,000. Considerable numbers of Volunteers are sending in their resignations because they are afraid of the continual calls upon their time and purse. This is a matter to be specially inquired into by the Royal Commission, and it affects both Militia and Volunteers, but especially the latter, with whom it is a very pressing matter.

On the subject of musketry, fresh regulations have just been issued. I understand from my right hon. friend that he would not issue them until he had ascertained how far they could be carried out by the Volunteers. However, they have been issued, but the Volunteer Corps are to have an option as to carrying them out this year, for which concession they are grateful. But I am told that the regulations will require at least three or four journeys to the range. That for a Metropolitan Corps is a very serious matter, as it takes up a whole afternoon to go to Bisley, and employers do not like Volunteers to be constantly asking for leave; they get tired of it and say, "You must choose between your employment and belonging to the Volunteers; we want our clerks here during office hours; we are willing to do what we can, but we cannot perpetually be giving leave, and, besides, it is not fair to the other clerks." It is a pity these regulations have been issued without first fully ascertaining how far the Volunteers are able to carry them out. I recognise that my right hon. friend is doing what he can to provide ranges. Members of this House, irrespective of Party, during the last thirty or forty years have gone to successive Secretaries of State, pointing out how all available land for ranges was being taken up and its price increasing. My right hon. friend is spending a large sum on the acquisition of land for ranges on Plumstead Marshes; the expense will be about £200,000, but if the step had been taken five years ago the land could have been secured for a quarter of the amount.

*MR. BRODRICK: Not five years ago.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Perhaps not five years ago; make it ten. But this agitation about ranges is not a matter of the last five or ten years. It has been going on for thirty or forty years, but we have never been able to convince the War Office of the paramount necessity of something being done, and the consequence is a greatly increased expenditure of public money.

The real difficulty, however, with which we have to contend, are the constantly changing regulations. If I were asked off-hand what are the regulations at the present moment for becoming efficient I could not say, and I am certain that neither my right hon. friend nor the Financial Secretary could. Before a man joins the Volunteers he asks what he will have to do, and it is absolutely necessary to have some simple standard. The constantly changing regulations are not only irritating to those who have to carry them out, but by preventing men from coming in, and inducing those who are in to resign, they sap the very life and efficiency of the Volunteers. I hope the necessity of arriving at some clear and definite standard of efficiency will be impressed on the Royal Commission, and that when such a standard has been arrived at it will have some little permanency at any rate. Staff officers were appointed for five years; they are now appointed for three; but every staff officer thinks he must make some little change of detail. My right hon. friend cannot realise the harm done or the difficulty caused by these little changes. Since the new regulations came into force nearly every Volunteer commanding officer has done his best loyally to comply with them. We have no desire to use our voice in this House, or such influence as we possess outside, to induce the War Office to do anything for the Volunteers which they think is unfair to the country. We desire to be brought up to a very high standard of efficiency, and, in order that the observations of the hon. Member for Gravesend may not be misinterpreted, I do not hesitate to say that the desire of the Volunteers is to work in with the Regular Army in every possible way. The more we can work in and be trained with the Regular troops the better we should like it. What we strongly object to is being treated by the Regulars as something quite apart from them. Do not let my right hon. friend imagine for a single moment that the Volunteers desire to be treated as something apart from the Regular Army. I do not share the views of some of my hon. friends that the defence of the country could be entrusted entirely to the Volunteer force. The Volunteer force is very active, numerous, energetic, and patriotic, but it undoubtedly wants on special occasions and for active service a stiffening of Regulars. There is not a single Volunteer or Volunteer officer who does not admit this fact. I could not possibly, however much I wanted money for the Volunteers, take that money to the disparagement of the Regular troops.

With regard to allowances, it must not be thought that the War Office is stingy in these matters. As the subject has been mentioned, the House ought to know that a young officer of Volunteers, on going to a School of Instruction, receives £10 1s. 6d. pay and allowances, either travelling or lodging, but not both, £7 11s., or a total of £17 12s. 6d., from which the Chancellor of the Exchequer deducts 12s. 7d. income tax. I think my right hon. friend might induce the Chancellor of the Exchequer to waive that deduction.

I hope this Royal Commission will be appointed quickly, that it will be small in the number of its members, and that it will be composed of gentlemen who have sufficient time to give to its deliberations in order that a report may be speedily framed and acted upon. The Prime Minister the other night said—

> "We appeal to the Volunteers as the real force on which we have to depend in case of emergency."

On that statement the country is bound to hold the Government to do everything it can to foster "the real force on which we have to depend in case of emergency." The hon. member for South East Durham mentioned the cost of the Volunteers. The cost is only £4 per head per annum. It is true that in the Army Estimates the amount for the force is £1,280,000, but from that you have to deduct £214,000 for the pay of Regular officers who act as adjutants, and Regular non-commissioned officers who act as sergeant-instructors, who, if they were not with the Volunteers, would be in the Regular Army.

*MR. BRODRICK: Oh no.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: However, whether it is £4, £5, or £6 per annum matters very little indeed; it is less than the annual cost even of the clothing of the Regular soldier. My right hon. friend must have been impressed by the fact that the opinion of the House, which represents the opinion of the country as a whole, is in favour of the Motion of my hon. friend. The attention of hon. Members has been drawn to the letters which have lately appeared in *The Times* on the problem of the Army. As regards the Auxiliary forces, the letter of 24th February so admirably sums up the whole position that I should like, in conclusion, to read an extract to the House—

> "The sole responsibility of the Auxiliary forces for the defence of the United Kingdom should be clearly recognised. They should have their separate Department in the War Office, and also on the general staff, where they would take over all the mobilisation work which is concerned with home defence. Money should be spent freely in providing them with rifle ranges and other facilities, and an effective Manœuvres Act should be passed to enable them to receive an adequate training."

If my right hon. friend will act up to that paragraph the Volunteers and the country will have all they desire, and large numbers of men will return to the force. I would urge him, whatever he does, not to allow his subordinates to be perpetually tinkering with and altering the regulations. Let us march with the spirit of the times; let there be a high standard fixed, but whatever the standard, let us stick to it, at any rate, for a few years. If that is done, every member of the force and the country at large will thank the right hon. Gentleman.

*MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I quite agree with the suggestion that we should cease the absurd practice of continually altering the regulations with regard to the Volunteers. I cannot, however, agree with the hon. and gallant Gentleman as to the question of camp allowances. I rise principally to allude to two points. In the first place, I am anxious that the Volunteer force should be further developed, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War will give this question his serious consideration. Those Volunteer Corps which are not chosen for the Field Army Brigades cannot be said to be satisfied with the conditions of grant existing now. The present system is very invidious indeed, especially under the new policy of concentrating outside battalions alongside those Army Corps, having in the same area at the same time members of a battalion who are only serving by the week. Consequently you have the invidious distinction of having practically in the same brigade one battalion receiving 5s. per day able to pay each Volunteer 2s. per day of pay, while within the same brigade there may be a battalion where the men are serving on the seven days system, doing the same work in the same place side by side, and that corps only receives 2s. 6d. per man per day, which is all required towards the expenses of the camp, and consequently they are unable to give their men any gratuity whatever. I think it is only fair, if we ask the Volunteers to sacrifice their work or to sacrifice their yearly holiday in order to give their services, we ought at least to see that the men are not out of pocket. I think the proposition laid before the War Office by the Commanding Officers Association that the battalion selected for the Field Army Brigade should get 6s. per man, and that those battalions which are not selected for the Field Army Brigade should get 4s. per man, is a fair proposal. Out of that sum they could at least give the seven days men 1s. 6d. per day.

My next point is in regard to the question of Volunteer transport. In the Volunteers there is really no system of transport. I know that individual brigades have organised transport, but the allowances at the present time given make it quite impossible for the Volunteer service to have anything like an efficient transport. The Volunteers at the present time are unable to go anywhere if there was a sudden call for their services at the place of mobilisation. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will give us some indication of what policy the War Office intend to pursue with regard to the transport for Volunteers. We must certainly face a larger expenditure here, but I think that expenditure can be saved on the Regular Army. I remember, in 1897, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer said he would challenge the Commander-in-Chief to say whether we were really getting an adequate return for the sum which was being voted to the Army. Whether we got an adequate return then I do not know, but now a much larger sum is to be spent on the Army, and the question is: Are we getting an adequate return for the greatly increased expenditure since that time? And I think the Secretary of State for War will admit that for the money spent on the Volunteers we really do get an adequate and a more than adequate return. I wish also to protest against the new regulations which have been issued, but which are now evidently to be modified. The War Office is always experimenting with the Volunteer force, and I am quite sure that the policy of the new regulations was one which, had it been successful, would have given us very indifferent Regulars, and would really have shattered the Volunteer force.

There is an impression in various quarters that these new regulations were the result of a deliberate policy to smash up the Volunteer force in order to pave the way for conscription. I disagree with that view altogether, although I think the effect would have been in that direction. I hope that the right hon. Gentleman will give the House some satisfactory statement with regard to the pay of Volunteers going into camp, and as to what the War Office intend to do with regard to transport. I may be heterodox in my view, but I dissent from the doctrine that you must get a system of perfection in the Volunteer force. What you want is as near perfection as possible, but above all you want to get as large a number of men as possible to undergo some system of training. If you lay that foundation, and the day of danger should arise, then you will be able to train those men to a greater state of perfection and make them ready for the work that will be before them. The policy of this country should be to have a small Army able to do anything and go anywhere, and leave behind it a very large auxiliary force. I have often stated that I would go so far as to say that every young man in the country capable of bearing arms should undergo a certain amount of military training so as not to interfere with his ordinary avocation, but such as is undergone by the Volunteers; if we did that, and reduced, as we might well reduce, our expenditure on the Regular forces by millions per annum, we should be doing a great service to the country and doing something to put this country in a state of preparedness for any eventuality.

Lord STANLEY: If ever I had any doubt as to the great desirability of appointing the Commission to inquire into the Auxiliary forces, that doubt would have been dispelled by the speech of the seconder of this Motion, which shows how deep-seated are the misconceptions with regard to the Volunteer force. I look to this Commission, which is to be appointed at once and which my right hon. friend is in hopes may report even before the end of the summer, to do two things. The first, which is comparatively easy, is to dispel the misconceptions to which I have referred, and show the great difficulties that exist in dealing with the Volunteer forces; and the other, which I do not envy them, is to endeavour to reconcile and to bring into one scheme the various propositions that are put forward. To-night, from both sides of the House, and even from the same side of the House, we have had diametrically opposite views expressed with regard to the construction and the organisation of the Volunteer force. We have had one hon. Member proposing that the Volunteers should organise themselves, and we have another proposing that there should be practically compulsory Volunteers. All these views must be gone into by a Commission. They cannot possibly be dealt with only by a Departmental Committee, and if they could be discussed they could not be decided across the floor of the House. I do not think people realise how difficult it is to deal with the Volunteer force. I certainly had no idea of it until the meeting of the second Committee upon those regulations. There must be, I think all will admit, a general system both of training and of pay. We must set up a fixed standard as to what is thought necessary for the efficiency of an individual Volunteer. We cannot say that one Volunteer, because he lives in a town, should take part in ten drills, and that another, because he has to walk five miles to the drill, need only therefore do five drills. I do not see how you can say that because one man has to walk a little further than another five drills will be sufficient for him instead of ten.

As regards pay, there is no doubt that in a great many corps the question of the amount of money given is of very great importance to the individuals in that corps. We certainly do not want to have any distinction in the pay of the Volunteers, to have one class of rich Volunteers and one class of poor, and there is no doubt that that ideal does operate very unequally on many corps. It is all very well to urge elasticity. To whom are we to give the power of exercising that elasticity? We cannot give it to commanding officers of battalions. We have, however, endeavoured in the Second Army Corps to give it to Sir Evelyn Wood, who will make all the arrangements for camps, and will make all the promotions, and we have left matters in his hands as to what will be convenient for the various battalions. That, I hope, will succeed. Again, I hope that we shall meet the wishes of Volunteers with the aid of the Advisory Committee, without whose consideration I hope no regulations in future will be issued to the Volunteer forces. But we must recognise that there is now an entire change in the constitution of the Volunteers as compared with their constitution when they first became a force. It was then composed to a great extent of men who had a certain amount of leisure; and the original idea was that they should train themselves, no fixed rule being laid down as to their drill. That is now completely altered, and a fixed standard of requirement has been laid down. But is it not absolutely necessary that the constitution should be changed if we are to depend in the main, as I believe we shall have to do, on our Volunteer force for the defence of these shores? The whole thing therefore, comes to be a question of pay for the corps, and that, of course, gives rise to the very large question whether we are to alter the constitution of the Volunteers from that of men who give the State something, into that of men to whom by right the State ought to pay a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. I shall not attempt to debate that point, for it must be laid before the

Commission, and it must be judged by those who will be more competent to decide; and it is only after their decision that this House should take into consideration the great change that would undoubtedly come about if we looked upon the Volunteers, instead of a force which gave their time, as one whose time would have to be paid for. The hon. Member says he does not wish camps to be compulsory. I can only judge of compulsory camps and their advisability by the evidence that was given before our Committee on the new regulations, before which there was not one single man, however much he might object to the general regulation that had been put forward, who did not say that in his opinion it was absolutely necessary that these men should go into camp.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: They said it would be better for them, but not necessary.

Lord STANLEY: I think that going into camp must be looked upon as a necessity, if they are to be considered as the main portion of our Home defence. The question of the diminution of men is not one that to my mind is so very alarming, for I believe it to be only passing and temporary. I know an instance of a battalion in which, of the men who resigned, over 70 per cent. came back again when the commanding officer told them that the new conditions imposed were less exacting than those they had voluntarily accepted in previous years.

*Mr. MACRAE: That was after the new regulations were modified.

Lord STANLEY: Certainly. I look upon the question of the diminution of the men as being a temporary and passing misfortune, but I do look upon the diminution of officers as being very serious indeed, and I undoubtedly think that that is, to a great extent, due to the financial burdens that are put upon them. The question of the debts of the various Volunteer regiments is, in some cases, very alarming to those who have to take them over. They have always been so, and therefore the question must come up before this Commission if in any way we desire to relieve those officers, not entirely, but to see how we can in any way assist them in bearing a burden which they have undertaken voluntarily, and which was due in its entirety to zeal for the corps which they commanded. The various suggestions which have been made by hon. Members are really so contradictory that one hardly knows whether one ought to deal with them at all. In the first place the seconder of the Motion said that my right hon. friend's Army Corps system stood or fell with the Volunteers that were included in these forces.

*Sir GILBERT PARKER: I said that the Army Corps stood or fell by the Volunteer system included in it.

Lord STANLEY: That was exactly what I thought I said, namely, that the Army Corps system stood or fell by the success of the Volunteers included in this scheme. If that is so, the Army Corps have no fear of further attack from my hon. friend, because the Army Corps Volunteers have been an unqualified success, for we have been able to get the men without the slightest difficulty.

*Sir GILBERT PARKER: My point was this. In time of war your Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Army Corps organisation would not stand, because the Regulars attached to these corps would naturally be sent abroad in an exigency, and therefore the brain and the organisation would be taken away.

Lord STANLEY: It is not contemplated that the troops of the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Army Corps would ever be sent abroad. It is contemplated that the staffs of these Army Corps shall, whatever happens, remain in this country for its protection, and that the forces they command—Regulars, Volunteers, and Militia—in time of peace, shall remain under their command in time of war for the defence of the country. The hon. Member says that no Volunteer is drawn for the place he is to be employed in in case of invasion. What does he mean by that? Does he know that for every single place that is to be defended by the Volunteers, the Volunteers are told off for those places, and that the defence guns will be manned to a great extent by the men of the Volunteer artillery? Of course there are some corps unallotted, and these corps would be used wherever the emergency required their services; but to say that no Volunteer is to train for the place he will be employed in is an inaccurate idea of the organisation that at present exists. The hon. Member wants apparently to divorce the Volunteers from the Regulars, to keep them apart, as something peculiar to themselves. My hon. friend behind me contradicted that at once. He is a practical Volunteer, and the expression of opinion which he has given is held by everybody, namely, that the more you can bring the Volunteers and the Regulars together the better it is for both. These forces have been coming together more and more every year, and no cause has contributed more to this result than the attachment of the Volunteer companies to the Regular forces in South Africa.

This Commission, when it sits, will have another and difficult duty to perform. I think it will have to say whether in any circumstances—and it is a debatable point—you are to put a limit to the Volunteer forces; that is to say, whether you are not to lay down one of two propositions: either unlimited numbers and not so much efficiency to be asked from them; or whether you think it would be better for the country to have a less force and greater efficiency; whether you should say to a district where you do not want in time of mobilisation a certain class of troops that no effort should be made to raise them, and thereby crush out the Volunteer movement. I wish that any word of mine could dispel the idea that the Volunteer force, so far as the War Office is concerned, is held in contempt. I have not heard a word there from those responsible for the management of the Army indicating that they look down in any way on the Auxiliary forces. On the contrary, I think they are trying to show how they can improve their efficiency, bring them more in touch with the Regular forces, and fit them for that place in our defences which has been allotted to them. Criticism ought not to be confused with condemnation. To criticise a force is surely not to condemn it. I would ask those who are inclined to take that view, whether it is fair to the Volunteer force as a whole that you should praise them, with perhaps lavish praise, or whether you should not be allowed to make criticism, as you must do on certain battalions that are bad, without being held to sneer at the force, and condemn it as a whole. I would only add that until we receive the Report of this Commission any recommendation made by an hon. Member interested in the Volunteer force with regard to the regulations will meet with the most sympathetic reception from the Committee which has now been formed to advise the Secretary of State on the administration of the Auxiliary forces, and on whose advice I feel confident that my right hon. friend will always act.

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick): I think that all interested in the Volunteer force will have been most glad to hear the announcement of a Royal Commission to inquire into all questions regarding it. All we can hope is that the reference will be sufficiently wide to cover all matters concerning the force, and also that the Commission will contain a full representation of men actually acquainted with the work of the Volunteers—men who have served in command of regiments and who in that way have a real knowledge of the very different circumstances of the Volunteers in different parts of the country. No one can accuse the noble Lord of insufficient appreciation of the position of the Volunteers, but I hope this Commission will be able to inquire whether the cast iron rigidity of the standard he wishes to lay down is right for the different classes of Volunteers, or whether it is not possible to establish a much wider choice of alternatives according to the different circumstances of different corps. Without waiting for the Royal Commission and its inquiry there are several points which are pressing very much upon the Volunteers, and which I hope I may be allowed to bring before the Secretary of State to-night. One of the smaller points is in regard to the artillery. The Prime Minister the other day, I understood, told us that the Volunteer artillery had now been supplied with breech-loading guns. That is a premature announcement certainly as regards the Artillery Volunteers with whom I am acquainted. I would very much like to ask the Secretary of State whether there is any real prospect of the Volunteers being supplied with breech-loading field guns instead of the obsolete muzzle-loading sixteen-pounders they have at present.

Then the question of shooting is one which is very pressing upon the Volunteers at present, not so much from the point of view of my hon. friend in regard to ranges, so far as the Volunteers with whom I am acquainted are concerned. Ranges are more easy to get hold of in Scotland, though there we certainly want many more. We want ranges where men can go and fire at short range, and where they can get that full familiarity with the rifle which is really wanted rather than the power to hit things 1,000 yards off. What we want is a greater supply of ammunition for the men to use, in order to get acquainted with the rifle. It is absurd to imagine a man can get the use of his rifle with any familiarity or skill on the mere number of rounds that he requires for class firing. You can get a great many Volunteers to take real pleasure and interest in shooting when they can get their ammunition cheap. To most of them the expense of the railway ticket to the range is quite enough. If you make them pay full price for ammunition it becomes prohibitive to the greater part of them. What you want is to induce them to take a greater interest in shooting, and to spend afternoon after afternoon in getting accustomed to the rifle, and to be able to use it freely means to allow them an ample supply of ammunition at a cheap rate. I believe the strictness of the regulations has been made on account of the misuse of the rounds. I believe it would be very easy to lay down regulations whereby this difficulty would be obviated. At any rate, I think it is far more important to let the man who shoots have the use of his weapon, rather than that the supply should be restricted because of the possibility of the misuse of a few rounds through being sold at a profit.

In regard to what is really the question pressing on Volunteer regiments now, namely, compulsory camps, I think it is not fully realised how entirely different are the circumstances of different regiments. The hon. Member opposite pointed to one difference—the grant of 5s. to some regiments and 2s. 6d. to others. To some regiments that will make all the difference. There are many regiments composed of artizans and labourers where the question whether you can give a man a small pay makes all the difference whether you can get a sufficient number to go into camp every year or not. Many regiments are perfectly satisfied with the present arrangement. With other regiments a small increase in the allowance per man would make things right for them. There are other regiments where the circumstances of the ordinary private are different. Where you have men in the position of artizans and labourers, it is usually a question of money, but where the ranks are fill with men from business, clerks in counting houses or banks, it is perfectly impossible for them to get away in sufficient numbers to go into camp. One or two of the smartest regiments I could name in Glasgow are of that kind. It is not a question of paying the men a half grant—5s. or 10s. would not make the least difference. The thing is simply impossible for them owing to the circumstance that they cannot get away. A bank cannot allow a quarter of its clerks to go away for a week. It can only allow a few of them to go. I think the noble Lord laid down the principle that it was impossible to consider the different circumstances of regiments, and that you must have some general standard. I do not think you want any Procrustean rule of that kind. You must have alternative if you are going to keep up the strength of the Volunteer force. It is most valuable that the men who become officers should first serve in the ranks. A man serves in the ranks of one regiment and then takes a commission in another; but it will be most difficult to maintain the requisite number of officers if this rule for compulsory camp attendance is insisted on. In regard to such matters as these there ought to be discretion vested in the general in command of a district as to whether some alternative in the way of efficiency in shooting, or other conditions, shall be substituted for compulsory camp service. I am exceedingly glad that the whole of these questions are going to be submitted to a Royal Commission, from whose work I have the utmost expectation.

COLONEL PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton): I am rather sorry that a Royal Commission is going to consider questions affecting the Volunteer force. I suppose that Commission will produce a report in about two years. During these two years what is to be the progress, or the decline, of the Volunteer force? I do not agree altogether with the speeches of my hon. friends the mover and seconder of this Motion. It seems to me that their speeches really contemplated a radical alteration in the constitution of the Volunteer force. I believe that the Volunteer force is far stronger than it was, except in numbers. The numbers have gone down 35,000, but that was only to be expected after the war was over. One thing that takes the heart out of the Volunteer force is the lukewarmness in dealing with shooting and ranges. These matters ought to be dealt with in a wholesale manner. There is no use whatever in having Volunteer battalions and not having ranges. My own battalion thirty or forty years ago had a range next to its own doors, and now it has to go seven or eight miles away. That is going to be taken away, and the only range in Lancashire will be the Altcar range.

All the battalions of Volunteer infantry are now attached to depôts of Regulars. The consequence was that in the South African war, when the Regulars were not sufficient, the Volunteer companies were called out and took their place in the Regular battalions. So far as I know the commanding officers of these Regular battalions were absolutely satisfied with the Volunteer service companies. I maintain that the treatment of the Volunteers ought to be equal to that of the Regulars, which has not been the case. Was the treatment of the Volunteer service companies who served side by side with the Regulars the same as that of the soldiers of the Line? Did they get the same medals? In neither case was the same equal treatment meted out. That is a deep grievance. There is a medal which every Regular soldier has, but which the Volunteers who served with him in South Africa have not got. And why? Simply because they were Volunteers. I heard a Volunteer officer say that as a result of this unequal treatment the Volunteers would not go again. Campaigning is the profession of a Regular soldier, but the members of these service companies left their civil employment and were only paid the same as the Regulars—not 5s. a day—and yet, when the need came, they were not treated exactly in the same way as the Regulars. Unless the Volunteer soldier and officer has, as far as possible, the same status as the Regulars his efficiency is impaired. The difficulty of getting Volunteer officers is not a question of money, but of status. The better classes of society in England will not officer the Volunteers (of that I am certain), although they will officer the Regulars and the Militia.

A great deal of the soreness against the Army Corps system was the treatment of the Volunteers. For many years Volunteer battalions had been accustomed to go to certain camps. I am quite at one with my right hon. friend the Secretary for War in regard to the Army Corps; but somehow by this Army Corps arrangement the Volunteer Brigade were put into confusion, and Volunteer battalions were taken out of their old brigade and put into a new one. Take my own experience. For ten years my battalion had been attached to a particular brigade, but we were suddenly changed and put into the Liverpool Brigade, the battalions of which I had never seen before. I wanted to go to Conway, where all our camp equipage was. There was a meeting of the officers at Liverpool, and, excepting myself, who wanted to go to Conway, all the officers voted to go to Salisbury Plain. I made representations to headquarters to go somewhere else, but eventually my battalion went to Salisbury

Plain, and I found that the battalion of the officers who had so strongly urged Salisbury Plain was not there! We thought Salisbury Plain an exceedingly nice place, and were very happy there. This year, however, I received a very short notice to go to Lancaster, but was unable to do so because I was busy with licensing business. I sent my second in command, but he did not do well at all, and came back with a paper to say that the battalion was to go to the Isle of Man, to Cannock Chase, or Aldershot. I thought it was rather hard lines again to change our camp equipage, which had been sent to Salisbury Plain. Of the three places mentioned, I preferred to go to Aldershot, but was afterwards told that there were to be no Volunteers this year at Aldershot, and that we must go to the Isle of Man. If I had been a naval officer on an ironclad I might have been glad to go to the Isle of Man, but I think that to send a brigade of Volunteers across the sea to that island is ridiculous. These are the kinds of things that vex and upset the Volunteers, although they do not seem very great. I do not say it is the fault of my right hon. friend the Secretary for War, who has done his best always for, and sympathises with, the Volunteers, but I think in many matters a greater consideration ought to be shown, and greater elasticity allowed.

There is another danger. Formerly we were able to go straight to the War Office and make representations, but now we are told that there has been decentralisation, and that we must go to the general of the district. [An HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!] It is all very well for an hon. Member to say "Hear, hear!" but my hon. friend should go with me to the Isle of Man when a stiff south-west wind is blowing in the Irish Channel. Generally speaking, I do not think that the Volunteer force has been given a check, but any advance that has been made is due to its own initiative, and not very much to the assistance of the War Office. What is required is to attach the Volunteer force and weld it, so to speak, still more to the Regular Army; and the linking system should also be carried out with the Yeomanry and Artillery. Where would the country have been in the South African War if that could not have been done? I believe that 150,000 Regular troops went to South Africa, and, including the Colonials, there were 150,000 Volunteers. The fact is, that if it had not been for the Volunteers and the Volunteer system at that time, the country would have had to retire in the day of trouble. I hope that the Royal Commission will not prevent us ventilating our grievances in this House, and I believe that we are greatly indebted to the mover and seconder of the Resolution for their efforts to encourage and improve the Volunteers.

*MR. LLEWELLYN: (Somersetshire, N.): Various reasons have been given for the deficiency of Volunteer officers. I have my own idea, which I put before the House many years ago. Any one who looks at the *Army List* at the present moment will see that there are a great number of Volunteer corps, as many as three and four, in one small town. The difficulty of getting officers for these is very great. I know a small seaside town near my own constituency, mainly depending on summer visitors, where there are three corps of Volunteers — artillery, engineers, sub-marines, and there is talk of reviving a corps of naval Volunteers. It is absolutely impossible that a town of that size can afford to provide officers for all these branches of the Service, and I consider that some of these corps should be merged into one another. These corps are, at times, very friendly towards each other, but there is at other times an amount of competition between them which cannot be good for any of them. In my own county there are two Line battalions, two Militia battalions, two regiments of Yeomanry, and all the Volunteers, and it is absolutely impossible to obtain the number of efficient officers to carry on properly their duties. This question is worthy of consideration by the Royal Commission.

*MR. DUKE (Plymouth): I hope that some of the dissatisfaction expressed at the recent action of the War Office in regard to the Volunteers will be removed by the statements which have been made on behalf of the Government. It is impossible not to feel that between the speeches of the Prime Minister, the noble Lord, and other Ministers within the last few days, and for a long time past the successive acts of the War Office, there is a discrepancy which almost amounts to a contradiction. First of all, there was the Order of 24th December, 1901, which caused dissatisfaction to the Volunteers at a time when they had rendered most conspicuous service to the country in South Africa, and vindicated their position as a reliable part of the scheme of Home Defence. Then there were the regulations as to Volunteer training and efficiency which have depleted many Volunteer corps of their most valued members. The commanding officers of Volunteer corps in my own part of the county have complained to me that those men who had left their corps were amongst the most experienced. The men whom they had lost had left, not because of any diminution of patriotic feeling on the cessation of the war, but because they, especially married artisans, feared that they could not comply with the demands of the War Office. And now there are further regulations in regard to musketry practice which are found to be irksome. I was a little surprised to hear the hon. and gallant Member for Sheffield say that the scale of allowances for camps was satisfactory. That is not what I hear from Volunteer officers, who tell me that if you are to have compulsory camps you must be in a position to make allowances to the men to enable them to go back home after a week or fortnight's training to their wives and families, not with empty hands, but with something in hand. However spirited and devoted these men may be to volunteering, they cannot make the sacrifices now asked. The acts of the War Office seem to be directed to convert the Volunteers into unattached soldiers, to be tested by the same scale of efficiency as the Regular soldiers. I do not know whether the noble Lord dissents from that proposition.

LORD STANLEY: I dissent.

*MR. DUKE: The noble Lord dissents, but if you are to have absolute proficiency in drill, in musketry, and in service in camps which fits the men for field exercises, you have got as good soldiers as most of the men in the rank and file of the Army. My belief is that if the test of efficiency of a soldier is to be applied to Volunteers, the Volunteer service must break down. There is an obvious difference between an efficient Volunteer and a Regular soldier. You cannot expect a man engaged day by day in civilian pursuits to be an efficient soldier, but if the whole of the conditions are satisfactory you can get a sufficient body of men enrolled who will devote themselves to service in times of emergency—men who have acquired the rudiments of military knowledge. Certainly the men whom His Majesty's forces had to meet in South Africa had very much less training than the Volunteer corps in this country. They consisted of farmers and others who chiefly practised rifle-shooting on public holidays, but they had efficiency enough to give His Majesty's Army a great deal of trouble. I do not share the enthusiasm of some hon. Gentlemen around me who think that the defence of the country can be entrusted solely to Volunteers, that the right hon. Gentleman comes with an extravagant scheme when he asks us for 120,000 fully-trained soldiers at all times, but I say the existence of the 120,000 soldiers ought to enable you to make less exacting demands on your 250,000 Volunteers. I hope the constitution of the Commission, and the scope of the inquiry of the Commission, will be such that by and by the country may get its Volunteer system put upon a footing more consonant with the public mind than the policy that the Volunteer should be converted into an indifferent soldier. I do not want to take up a great deal of time, but I should like to say a few words further with regard to what is to be done in the meantime. If this Commission is to be of any service, it will have to go to the root of the whole matter of home defence. A man who volunteers makes an unusual display of patriotism. Many of us think that the defence of the country is the business of the whole of the citizens, and that if a man has not acquired the rudiments of military knowledge he ought to be made to acquire them. If you get that basis behind your Volunteers, I think the

Commission may have the result of making the Volunteers even more popular than they now are. But, at the same time, I venture to submit that while you make volunteering as widespread as possible, you should make the burden as light as possible. The complaint which is made by the Volunteers, and by friends of Volunteers in the country, is that although the War Office does so little in a pecuniary sense and makes so very little display of sympathy—I am not speaking of the right hon. Gentleman or the Financial Secretary, but of the soldiers who look on the Volunteers as inefficient items for public defence—although the War Office does so little to show practical sympathy, it demands so much. I hope the result of the inquiry will be to reconcile the demands of the country on the Volunteers with the assistance the country gives to the Volunteers in recognition of their services. If that is done, I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman will be dissatisfied with the Volunteer force. But until the Commission has reported I hope that the right hon. Gentleman, who depends on the Volunteers for public defence, as his Army scheme shows, and the Prime Minister, who has declared his confidence in the Volunteers as a part of the defensive forces of the country, will take care that the Volunteers are not harassed by such restrictions on the part of the War Office as the Order of December 1901, and the regulations which from time to time have been issued since then.

*MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I venture to think that if the speech we have just heard from the noble Lord, the Financial Secretary to the War Office, is the reply of the Government to the demands of the Volunteers, the country will be profoundly disappointed. We did think, after all we had heard about the Volunteers during the last few years, that the War Office might have been able, without the aid of a Commission, to decide what was necessary to uphold the force. I heard a few minutes ago that this was the thirteenth Commission appointed by the present Government; and I therefore think that the people of the country, and the Volunteers especially, will have no confidence whatever in it. Is this Government to go down to history as the Government of Commissions? It looks extremely like it. There is no doubt whatever, that in the minds of the great mass of the people of this country there is a profound belief that the War Office is doing its best to discourage the Volunteer force; and if the Government were determined to take any step, no matter what it might be, to give the people grounds for the belief that such was the case, they have chosen the very best course by promising to appoint this Commission, which, to my mind, is absolutely unnecessary. The authorities at the War Office know perfectly well what the Volunteers require. It has been reiterated over and over again. They do not require much. What have the Volunteers been asking for for the last two or three years? They have been asking that they should have accessible rifle ranges, which at the present time many Volunteer regiments have not. They have been asking that they should have efficient modern guns, which many of them have not got. I know a gallant Volunteer Artillery officer who served in South Africa, and who has been decorated with the D.S.O. He has now to drill his men with obsolete muzzle-loading guns. Is that an encouragement? Then Volunteer officers claim that they should be reimbursed in a more generous manner than they are at present for out-of-pocket expenses; and, above all, that working men who give their time, and give it generously, should not be called upon to go into compulsory camps without being paid.

These are the main points, to my mind, on which Volunteers complain; and yet, instead of granting their claims, they are going to get a Royal Commission to inquire into their wants, many of which, to my certain knowledge, have existed ever since 1859. Like my hon. friend the Member for Plymouth, I should like to know what is going to happen during the one or two years that will be occupied by this Commission in regard to the Regular Army. There is an opinion that six Army Corps are not necessary. Personally, I am well aware that I voted for these six Army Corps;

but why did I and many others vote for them. Because, in the first place, we were recommended to do so by the Government, and we were told that while the war was raging we would take a great responsibility by refusing to do so; and also because we were told that the Volunteers would be generously treated. Ever since then, instead of the Volunteers being generously treated, we have found that they have been ungenerously treated; and that the new regulations governing them were put into operation without due consideration. If the Government are so fond of Commissions why did they not appoint a Commission before they put these regulations into force? When they were in force, and when the Government saw their effect, they were modified. Why were not the modified regulations put in force first, and the strain gradually tightened on the Volunteers? The Government have gone the right way to wreck the Volunteer force and the country will resent it, because the country has confidence in the Volunteers, and that confidence has been justified by the way the Volunteers acted during the South African War. I say further that the country is willing to pay the necessary expense in order to provide the Volunteers with the necessaries they demand.

We know perfectly well that Lord Roberts has announced over and over again that he was profoundly grateful to the Volunteers for what they did in South Africa. Speaking at Bisley, he said that whatever other qualifications a man might possess to be an efficient soldier he must be a good shot, and at the Mansion House he publicly thanked the Volunteers for what they had taught the Regular Army with regard to shooting. Yet, after these expressions from such an authority, we find the Volunteer force still clamouring for rifle ranges, and if they are to continue to clamour for the next two years, I am afraid that the Government will find it will be most unpopular. I remember when the right hon. Gentleman was introducing his scheme for the six Army Corps, he told the House that after Waterloo the country went to sleep for forty years in regard to military matters, and that after the Crimean War the country went to sleep for ten years. But the country at the present time is not likely to go to sleep in regard to military matters, especially in regard to the Volunteers; and if the right hon. Gentleman thinks that the Commission will prove a sleeping draught he will find himself mistaken.

Now I should like to remind the House of a fact that is sometimes forgotten, and that is who compose the Volunteer force. We know that in regard to the Regular Army, according to the Recruiting Report for 1901–2, that it has largely to rely for recruits on agricultural labourers. I think that 669 out of every 1000 recruits are agricultural labourers; and yet we are getting these men at a time when we are told by Lord Roberts and other generals back from South Africa, that it is more than ever necessary that we should have men of greater intelligence in our Army. The Regular Army never touches the class of which the Volunteers are mainly composed. The Volunteers are mostly composed of the upper working classes and the middle classes, who rarely go into the Army. And yet we are told by the right hon. Gentleman that the more the soldier is merged into the citizen by short service the more popular the Army will be. Very well. If you want to bring citizens as a whole into touch with the Army, you must uphold your Volunteer corps; if not, you get the agricultural labourer—I do not refer to him in any term of disrespect—and you leave out the great middle class altogether. What is the use of military authorities and civilians going about the country addressing great public meetings, and telling the people how necessary it is that all our youths should be taught how to shoot and how to use military weapons, if you have no Volunteer force into which you can draft them. I should like to impress on the right hon. Gentleman the important factor that the middle classes are in regard to the Volunteer force. They are certainly intelligent, and it is absolutely necessary we should get them into that force. Do not forget that in our hour of trouble in South Africa we were very anxious to get their services. The very pick of our population emigrate to Canada and other places, and the Army and Navy also take a large portion of the best of our young men at a time when they would be most useful in our factories and workshops; but if we could put these men into the Volunteers, then their services would not be lost, as the services of so many of them are now lost. In his Report the Inspector General of Recruiting regrets to find a great falling off in the physical standard of the working classes of this country. If that is so, we cannot afford, the very great Army which the Government asks for.

I would ask the Government, and I believe the country as a whole will agree with me, to continue to endeavour to complete three Army corps, and let the organisation of the others remain until the question of the Volunteers is settled. We do not want such a very large Army as that for which the Government is asking. True, they are only endeavouring to carry out what Parliament has granted but, at the same time, as the country pays the bill, it ought to have something to say in this matter, and I know that it is the opinion of the country that it would be better to have a small and highly efficient Army, and a very large Volunteer force backed up by Yeomanry and Militia, than a very great Regular Army, the existence of which perhaps will be advanced as an excuse that we need not have a large and efficient Navy. We do want an efficient Navy, and the country is prepared to pay for it; and I trust we shall never hear in this House that we cannot have an efficient Navy because we are spending so much money on the Army. I know it is difficult to alter the minds of the military authorities, but as I was walking down Parliament Street a few days ago, it struck me that the new War Office building would be a very handsome and commodious structure, and I trust that when the War Office officials get into that building they will carry out a more enlightened policy, and that when they leave their old building they will leave behind them many of its antiquated traditions, and, although they may carry some of the old furniture with them, I would appeal to them to leave behind the red tape which for so many years has been the curse, not only of the Army, but of the country as a whole.

*MR. BRODRICK: I am not going to follow my hon. friend the Member for Newcastle into the somewhat impassioned appeal he has made; but I must say I never heard a speech that shows more the necessity for a Royal Commission being held into the condition of the Volunteer and Militia forces. My hon. friend is one of those who speak obviously from conviction; but it is obvious he has not considered, in any adequate degree at all events, if he has considered at all, what are the relative possibilities of action by Volunteer forces and by Regular forces; and he treats the whole question as a sort of struggle between the two—which it is not in the eyes of any military man. My hon. friend entirely ignores not merely the military possibilities, but even the actual facts of what has been done. In the very years in which it is said that the Volunteer force has been starved and discouraged in respect of finance, very large additions have been made, large as compared with the previous cost of the force, which even my hon. friend, as a business man, would be first to recognise. The Volunteer force is now between 50,000 and 60,000 more than it was in 1870. In 1870, there were only 200,000 Volunteers, and there are at this moment about 250,000, or an increase of one in five. In 1870, the money spent on the Volunteers was £600,000; last year it was £1,720,000. That is to say that the Volunteers now cost three times as much, and that the actual rise in numbers is as one in five. I only mention these facts because it is important to consider them. My noble friend accurately stated the case when he said that we are in this position: The general efficiency of a considerable number of corps has not come up to what the military authorities say is essential if they are to be maintained in their present position. A certain number of corps are admirable; they are fully officered and fitted to work with the Regulars. But there is a very serious deficiency, and there always has been, of officers, not only in the Volunteers, but also in the Militia force; and the sole object of the military authorities has been not to discourage the Volunteers, but to endeavour to obtain from those corps which are not so efficient the same efficiency as the better corps give. That is an ambition which the military authorities have a right to hold. In enforcing that species of efficiency the military authorities have placed enormous value on going into camp. A great deal has been said about going into camp; and I merely wish to give the House one illustration. I remember a commanding officer coming to me and saying it was perfectly useless to ask his corps to go into camp—they could not go into camp. He said also it was quite impossible for the whole of his corps to do battalion drill at the same time, because the drill hall would only allow a little more than a quarter of the men to drill at a time, and it was impossible to drill in the open without going into camp. That really meant that, although this was an admirable corps, and well officered, only a quarter of the corps could be exercised at one time unless they went into camp. Was it too much, in these circumstances, to make it not only possible, but absolutely necessary, that these corps should be brought into camp, where they could learn what were the essentials of modern warfare? That was not an attack on the Volunteers—it was nothing to their discredit. On this point I think the country should come forward, if they could, and assist in that respect. But if you are going to make going into camp a subject of payment—and I am very far from saying it may not be necessary, and possibly desirable—you are putting the Volunteers into rather a different position from that in which they were before, and these are two points the Royal Commission will have to consider. The first is that the Regulars enlisted for three years, the Militia for five years, and the Yeomanry for five years; shall the Volunteers not give longer notice than fourteen days before leaving the Colours?

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: My hon. friend knows that it is practically three or four years, under the contract with the commanding officers.

*MR. BRODRICK: In most corps, by making a very small payment, a man can relieve himself from the contract.

SIR. HOWARD VINCENT: £5 or £6.

*MR. BRODRICK: The amount varies in different corps. The other point is the question of numbers, and that is really a military question. I entirely agree with what has been said to-night of the advantage of military training. At the same time, the whole subject is a very difficult and complicated one. All I have to say at present is that I fully recognise the views that have been expressed in this discussion. I can honestly say that from the time I first went to the War Office in 1886—when I was a member of the Committee which proposed a considerable addition to the allowances to Volunteers—I have done my very best to forward the interests of the corps. But the difficulty of accommodating the needs of the various corps is extremely great, and I think the time has come when the whole question might well be considered by the Royal Commission. I have great hopes that we may receive a very early Report. I shall lose no time in getting its appointment carried out, and in the meantime I think that the discussion to-night, perfectly unprejudiced as it has been, will be valuable. In conclusion I now appeal to hon. Members to allow the House to get into Committee.

*MR. McCRAE: The right hon. Gentleman has said nothing about transport for Volunteers.

*MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Gentleman is under a misapprehension if he thinks that each Volunteer unit can be provided with transport of its own. That would be impracticable. The subject, however, has not been lost sight of.

*MR. McCRAE: I was on the Committee on Volunteer Transport to which the right hon. Gentleman referred, and am anxious to know whether the War Office intend to act upon our recommendations.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): The statement of the right hon. Gentleman on this subject is so unsatisfactory that I feel it incumbent upon me to continue the debate and to make it clear that I, for one, am not content with what we were told some days ago by the Front Bench—that we had little right to take exception to the Army Corps system, or to the arrangement relating to the Volunteers, because in the stress of a great war we voted for it. We voted for that scheme because we thought it laid the foundation for an Army system, and that time and common sense would be applied to the working out of the scheme, with due regard to the circumstances and character of the nation. I do not know how far its advantages have been carried out, but I do say that the right hon. Gentleman, having brought in a system, has had to appoint a Royal Commission to find out how best he can clear up the mess—or, if he does not like the phrase, make the system one which will not destroy the whole of the Volunteer movement, but will make it an effective force. As one who has been closely associated with Volunteer regiments, and has been able to listen to the various points of view which have been advanced, I assert that the regulations laid down were simply cast-iron. They made no distinction between town and country corps; they assumed that the lives of the artisan and the labourer were the same, and they asked from both the same service as if they lived under the same conditions. A country corps can camp easily, whereas a town corps can easily manage drill although not in camp. A North or East London artisan, earning something like £1 per week, although he may be a keen and useful Volunteer, may not be able to obtain the leave of his employer to go into camp, and if he insists on going may be told to go about his business altogether. Surely the regulations might have made it practicable for so many drills to count in lieu of the camp, or for the number of days in camp to be reduced. Not a bit. These regulations allow no such elasticity, and, speaking of a regiment which did remarkably well in South Africa—I refer to the Tower Hamlets Brigade—I can only say that the officers have been greatly discouraged by the loss of many of their best men. By these regulations you have dealt a very serious blow at the young manhood, as found in the Volunteers who form the rank and file of that regiment, and who by their military work keep themselves in good health and greatly conduce to the maintenance of the standard of manhood.

Another unfriendly action of the War Office towards regiments of that description is to be found in the fact that whilst that regiment was furnished with Maxim guns—not at the public expense, but by those who contributed to the funds of the City Imperial Volunteers—the War Office refuse the cost of the harness, and no allowance is made at manœuvres for the hauling of those guns. Either the commanding officer or a friend of the regiment had to find the money for the harness, or the guns had to be man-hauled. The result is that the men are discouraged, those who are interested in the regiment are discouraged, and the vital blow is struck at a regiment which has done a good deal to preserve the physique of the young men of London. The difficulties do not end there. We feel that under the Army Corps system we see in the minds of the authorities some form of compulsory service which is to be made universal. I believe that when the day comes for us to appreciate how necessary an adequate defensive force is to the country we shall not be hostile to the idea of compulsory service, provided it is conducted on business lines. Although my right hon. friend said a minute or two ago that it was wrong to think that the high authorities in Pall Mall wished to discourage the Volunteers, he has certainly not been able to show by any act in his administration that he has encouraged them; and it is because we believe that the arrangement now in force by the remission of the whole question to a Royal Commission, is fraught with danger to the future, we and all who take an interest in this subject are determined, however imperfectly, to appeal to the Government not to allow this thing to drift on, but to make use of the great latent forces which lie in the people, and thus give first hand to the Crown a sufficient and enormous mass of men, which can only be done if their training is conducted on lines which permit the earning of their livelihood and do not risk the loss of their avocations.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I hope my right hon. friend will agree to an adjournment of the debate. This has been a most interesting and valuable discussion, and I think we have made more progress than the Government expected. I desire to refer to one or two general questions, and I beg to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have no power to resist the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman, but I think it is most inconvenient. All the points that hon. Members desire to raise can be debated in Committee, and I certainly think it would be far better. We should be able to begin to-morrow's proceedings by allowing the right hon. Gentleman to make his statement to the House in Committee. Of course, however, it is impossible to resist the Motion of the hon. Gentleman if he insists upon putting it.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): A question which some hon. Members on this side of the House wish to draw attention to is the expenses of officers in the Regular Army.

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (TRANSFER OF POWERS) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said the Government were well aware there was a very strong opposition to this Bill, and he protested against its being taken at a few minutes before midnight. It proposed that certain powers might be transferred from the Local Government Board to County Councils. The matter was discussed in a private Bill before a Committee of the House, who threw it out. Since then there had been notices of objection put down by hon. Members on both sides of the House, and more particularly by Members on the Government side. The reason of the objections was that whilst Parish Councils did not object to being under the Local Government Board with regard to the exercise of these powers, they objected to be placed under the County Councils, which were local authorities who might be influenced by the views of people in the locality.

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

Adjourned a two minutes after
Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 10th March, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:

Scottish American Mortgage Company, Limited [H.L.].

Hastings Harbour District Railway [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Bradford Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Read 2ª (according to order).

Old Bridewell Burying Ground Bill [H.L.].

Somerset and District Electric Power Bill [H.L.].

Rickmansworth Gas Bill [H.L.].

Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.

Annual Report and Accounts of the Governors, for the year ended 31st December, 1902. Presented [by Command] and ordered to lie on the Table.

EDUCATION (WELSH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION ACT, 1889).

Report of the Board of Education on the administration of schools, under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act 1889. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL [H.L.].

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, the practice against which this Bill is directed, of giving secret commissions, is, I regret to believe, very much on the increase. Indeed, few people realise the extent with which it has spread and is spreading. Your Lordships will remember that the late Lord Russell of Killowen, then Lord Chief Justice of England, himself introduced a Bill on this subject, which was received with sympathy in this House, but which contained one or two defects that prevented its being very enthusiastically received in the other House. In the first place, it was too wide. It is not an uncommon thing, when one discovers a great system of fraud, to attempt drastic remedies, and it is sometimes forgotten that the effect of attempting with great violence to alter any course of events is that your measure has little chance of passing into law, and that, if it passes, the very violence of it prevents its being put into operation. The Bill now before your Lordships does not possess these defects. Before I explain the provisions of the Bill I should like to quote one or two of the conclusions of the Special Committee of the Chambers of Commerce on the system with which this measure attempts to deal—

> "Your Committee conclude from the evidence before them that secret commissions in various forms are prevalent in almost all trades and professions to a great extent, and that in some trades the practice has increased, and is increasing, and they are of opinion that the practice is producing great evil, alike to the morals of the commercial community and to the profits of honest traders.
>
> "Bribes in all forms, including secret commissions, owe their existence sometimes to the desire of the donor to obtain the assistance of the donee; sometimes to the demand expressed or implied of the donee that the bribe shall be given.
>
> "In the first class of cases your Committee have reason to believe that the bribe is often given unwillingly and with a pang of conscience, as the result of the keen competition in trade, and in the fear, too often well founded, that unless given, other less scrupulous rivals will obtain an advantage; many cases have come before your Committee in which traders have believed (often, though not perhaps always, without reason) that their entire failure to obtain orders has been due to the want of a bribe.
>
> "The second class of cases are those in which the recipient extorts the bribe from those who have established business relations with his principal. This practice is rendered more effective and oppressive by a combination between the blackmailers. The servant or agent who demands a commission, and fails to receive it, not infrequently warns his fellows in the same position in the trade against the honest trader, who thus finds himself shut out from dealings with a whole circle of firms."

The Report of the Committee dealt with a great variety of offences—it even gave and then see whether or not the Bill is sufficient to meet the real evil, and, if not, to amend it by subsequent legislation. There is one point in regard to which I think the Bill needs amendment. I do not think it sufficiently deals with commissions paid for past services. It often happens that corrupt commissions are not paid at the time of the business transaction, but after the order is completed some method is found of remunerating the agent. These, however, are points more properly considered when we go into Committee on the Bill.

On Question, agreed to; Bill read 2ª accordingly and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

THE 1st BATTALION GRENADIER GUARDS.

*THE DUKE OF BEDFORD: My Lords, I beg to ask His Majesty's Government the Questions standing in my name on the Paper, viz.—

"1. Whether the ordinary strength of a battalion at home is about 700 of all ranks, and if the 1st Battalion Grenadier Guards, when under command of Colonel Kinloch, had for a considerable time about 3,000 men on the company pay lists of the battalion, and about 2,500 men in barracks.

"2. Whether during Colonel Kinloch's command 1,600 recruits joined the battalion, and over 2,000 officers, non-commissioned officers and men were equipped and sent out in drafts to South Africa, and whether these drafts were well reported on by the inspecting officer previous to embarkation; whether 1,230 men invalided from South Africa passed through the battalion, and whether the Reservist Company disposed of 1,746 men since June, 1900; and whether about 1,500 Reservists from the 2nd and 3rd Battalions were paid off and disposed of.

"3. Whether during the period of Colonel Kinloch's command about forty officers joined the battalion; and whether at one time there were about twenty second lieutenants doing duty, and only two senior subalterns, both of whom were absent on detachment.

"4. Whether during the five months from November, 1901, to March, 1902, inclusive, the battalion was without a quartermaster, a second lieutenant acting as quartermaster, in consequence of which Colonel Kinloch had to equip drafts for the front himself; and whether the battalion was not at one time without an orderly room clerk.

"5. Whether the ordinary strength of a company at home is about 100; and whether the number of non-commissioned officers was not at one time so short in the 1st Battalion Grenadier Guards that one company's pay sergeant alone had 500 men on his list.

"6. Whether Colonel Kinloch applied several times for clerical help which could not be provided."

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of HARDWICKE): My Lords, the questions of the noble Duke contain a number of figures which I do not propose to contradict. In order to verify them it would have been necessary for the War Office to ask the regiment to prepare a return which would have entailed a considerable amount of work on the staff; and, owing to the circumstances in which the 1st Battalion of the Grenadier Guards was situated during the South African war, we are willing to accept the noble Duke's figures, with two minor exceptions. The ordinary strength of a battalion at home is not 700 of all ranks, but 831; and the number on the company pay lists under Colonel Kinloch's command was not 3,000, but 3,300 men. I admit that the staff of the battalion under Colonel Kinloch's command was placed in great difficulty owing to the large amount of work it had to perform during the war; but the situation of the staff of this battalion in no way differed from that of all other regimental staffs at home during the war. The simple matter is that the staffs of all the regiments were apportioned to the organisation of a field army of 75,000 men, while they really had to administer and supply during the war a force of 250,000 men abroad. It was therefore inevitable that a very severe administrative strain should have been placed on the clerical staffs of all the battalions; but, in order to prevent a recurrence of these administrative difficulties, His Majesty's Government two years ago brought forward their scheme for reorganising the Army. The noble Duke lays particular stress on the fact that the clerical staff of the battalion was overtaxed, and he asks whether

Colonel Kinloch applied several times for clerical help, which could not be provided. The answer to that question is in the negative. What Colonel Kinloch did, was to apply in writing in the summer of 1900, and again by personal interview in the following year, for double extra duty pay for the existing staff of soldier clerks. Such an issue would not in any way have relieved the pressure of clerical work, and there was no regulation which would have enabled the War Office to grant such a request, but they informed Colonel Kinloch that additional soldier clerks, with the usual rates of extra duty pay, might be appointed to relieve the pressure. As a matter of fact Colonel Kinloch made no further application to the War Office, therefore we can only assume that he did not take on the extra staff which he was authorised to employ. The War Office is well aware that a very heavy strain fell on that staff, but I must repeat that they were not in an exceptional position. The whole Army was strained, as must happen during a war, and the position of the War Office simply is that in such circumstances every soldier must do his utmost for the pay of his rank. It is just as much the duty of a colour-sergeant to do extra clerical work in time of pressure as for a foot soldier to march forced marches without extra pay when called upon to do so.

*THE DUKE OF BEDFORD: I beg to ask the noble Earl for a reply to my seventh Question.

"Who is responsible for directing a unit of 3,000 men, the strength of a brigade, to be administered with a staff insufficient for a battalion of 700 men."

The noble Earl the Under Secretary of State for War has accepted more or less the figures I have quoted, which I think proves that Colonel Kinloch's command was not that of a battalion, but of a unit amounting to the strength of a brigade. Colonel Kinloch was unfortunate in having no chain of responsibility among his officers such as he ought to have had according to the service regulations. The noble Earl said the extraordinary strain is in future to be remedied. I do not see that this is any excuse for having put such an extraordinary strain on Colonel Kinloch in the past. The War Office have treated him as Pharaoh treated the children of Israel when he required them to make bricks without straw, and said that although they had no straw they must give the same tale of bricks. It is easy to put responsibility on the shoulders of a commanding officer, but it is not so easy in the case of the War Office to determine who is responsible. I therefore put the Question standing in my name.

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE: I thought that in the few remarks I made I fully explained how the strain came to be put on Colonel Kinloch, and I can only repeat that his case was not an isolated one. Hundreds of colonels throughout the country had the same administrative strain placed upon them in consequence of the war.

LORD RIBBLESDALE: In his third Question the noble Duke asked whether "at one time" there were about twenty second-lieutenants doing duty and only two senior subalterns, both of whom were absent on detachment. It would be interesting to know what that particular time was, and how long it lasted. Can the noble Duke tell us?

*THE DUKE OF BEDFORD: I am afraid I cannot give the exact date at this moment.

*THE DUKE OF BEDFORD: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether it is a fact that Colonel Kinloch was not allowed to speak in his own defence until nine days after his sentence had been promulgated at Aldershot. Our military procedure admits of an officer being sentenced before he is charged and being condemned unheard, and I believe that was the course followed in the case of Colonel Kinloch. I am not myself in favour of that procedure, and I think it will always be a fruitful source of trouble, for it is absolutely repugnant to the sense of the whole British nation as well as to the British Army. In this particular case it was generally understood that Colonel Kinloch had been allowed as a matter of favour that which he could not claim as a matter of right, and that he had been fully heard in his defence. When we are told that a man has been heard in his defence, we naturally assume that he has been heard before being condemned, but now I gather from the statement of the Secretary of State for War that he was not so heard until nine days after his sentence had been promulgated at Aldershot.

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE: It is true that Lieutenant-Colonel Kinloch did not see the Commander-in-Chief until nine days after his sentence had been promulgated at Aldershot. No officer has a right to interview the Commander-in-Chief in such circumstances; and Lieutenant-Colonel Kinloch's case did not differ in any respect from similar cases with which Lord Roberts has had to deal, except that Lieutenant-Colonel Kinloch complained that his personal honour had been impugned, and consequently Lord Roberts arranged an interview with him, as an act of grace, not as of right, at which the Adjutant-General and the General Officer Commanding the Home District were present. Colonel Kinloch fully stated his case, and was assured that, although his judgment and supervision as a commanding officer were in question, there was no slur on his honour. The dereliction of duty for which Lieutenant-Colonel Kinloch has been punished might have been committed by an officer commanding a battalion at some out of the way part of the Empire whom it would have been impossible for the Commander-in-Chief to have seen before coming to a decision on the case, and Lord Roberts cannot think it would be fair to countenance one code of discipline for a regiment which may happen to be favourably situated for access to the authorities and a different code for other units of His Majesty's service. The King's Regulations are applicable to the whole Army; there is nothing laid down in them which gives an officer a right to see the Commander-in-Chief in order to speak in his own defence; and the honour and credit of all officers in the Army are equally sacred to Lord Roberts, irrespective of the branch of the service to which they may belong.

Lord Roberts formed his opinion of Lieutenant-Colonel Kinloch's conduct from the evidence given by that officer before the Regimental Court of Inquiry held by the General Officer Commanding the Home District, and from General Sir Henry Trotter's summing up of the report of that meeting. The general tenour of General Trotter's communication was to the effect that, while Colonel Kinloch was unaware of the treatment the subalterns had received, it was his duty as commanding officer to satisfy himself that all was going on well with those under his command. I need hardly say, my Lords, that Sir Henry Trotter most deeply deplored the whole circumstance, and considered it discreditable in the highest degree. At the interview which Lord Roberts accorded to Lieutenant-Colonel Kinloch excuses urged by that officer were precisely the same as those which had been previously brought to Lord Roberts's notice—namely, that he had been unusually hard-worked, and that he was ignorant of what had occurred, neither of which reasons seemed to the Commander-in-Chief sufficient for him to alter the decision he had come to. I desire to emphasise the fact that Colonel Kinloch gave evidence before a Court of Inquiry appointed by Sir Henry Trotter, and that it was on that evidence that the Commander-in-Chief formed his opinion.

*LORD BELHAVEN: My Lords, with the indulgence of your Lordships I desire to make a personal statement with regard to that made by the Secretary of State for War in another place, to the effect that Lord De Saumarez and I had called on the Commander-in-Chief and made a verbal complaint of the treatment of young officers in the Grenadier Guards. To this, which was quite contrary to fact, I demurred; and failing to obtain a retractation from the Secretary of State, I made the contradiction which appeared in the public Press on Saturday last. As, however, the right hon. Gentleman has made a further statement in another place which, while admitting my contention, does not give sufficient prominence to the points where I disagreed with the first statement, I ask to be allowed to read an extract from a letter of Lord De Saumarez to the noble Earl the Commander-in-Chief, which he has had since last Thursday, and which I must presume was in his possession when the statement of the Secretary of State was made last night—

"Lord Belhaven particularly stated to Lord Roberts that he was not there to make a complaint himself, but only to corroborate those facts stated by me in connection with Mr. Leveson-Gower's case, with which he was himself acquainted."

These facts referred to the so-called meeting of some ensigns in his house, who called to ask his advice, and nothing else.

There are minor points on which my recollection does not agree with that of the noble Earl; but I have too great a respect for him personally, and for the high office he fills, to wish to enter into controversy upon any points of minor importance. There is, however, one matter in the report which the right hon. Gentleman read yesterday in another place which I must take exception to. I refer to the inadequate manner in which the way I had expressed myself about Colonel Kinloch on that occasion was described. So far from my having only accepted Colonel Kinloch's statement, I expressed to the noble Earl my unqualified confidence in that officer; and your Lordships will fully understand my reasons for feeling that confidence, if you will allow me to read a letter which I received from Colonel Kinloch on December 1, at a date when the matter was not yet public, and no charge had been made against him.

"20, Eaton-place, S.W.
"Dec. 1, 1902.

"DEAR LORD BELHAVEN,

"Thanks for your letter. I am only in London for a few hours, as I cannot leave my brother, who is not expected to live many hours. I think it only right to tell you that I have only heard this morning—not from your boy—that he was most outrageously treated some months ago at the instigation of a very senior subaltern, who is not at present serving in my battalion. If what I have been told is true, it will be a very serious matter for this officer, as I immediately reported what had come to my ears to Colonel Ricardo, and told him that if after inquiry, which will be made, there are good grounds for believing this report, in my opinion most serious steps should be taken. What I shall never be able to understand is why your boy did not come to me. If he had, and if inquiry had brought out the facts as I heard them this morning, the officer in question would without doubt have lost his commission. Yours very truly,

"DAVID A. KINLOCH."

With that letter in my pocket I do not think any of your Lordships will believe that I would have gone and made a complaint against Colonel Kinloch.

*EARL ROBERTS: My Lords, I did not intend to take any part in this debate, but I cannot allow the noble Lord's statement to pass unchallenged. I will endeavour in a very few words to explain what occurred on the day when Lord De Saumarez visited me. He came to the War Office on December 12; I was not there at the time, but my private secretary saw him and said that I would be back at four o'clock. If he preferred he could see me at six o'clock at my own house. Lord De Saumarez preferred to come to my own house; and when he arrived there he told me he had some very important matters to tell me with regard to the First Battalion of the Grenadier Guards. He then went into the whole story of what had occurred in the battalion, and after explaining all the facts of the case with regard to the courts-martial held by the senior subalterns, and of the results of those courts-martial, I told him that it would be impossible for me to look upon his visit as a private one, and that as Commander-in-Chief I must take the matter up officially. He then said, "I have brought Lord Belhaven with me. Will you see him? He is in the next room." I said I would, though I had not the pleasure of Lord Belhaven's acquaintance. I went into the next room with Lord De Saumarez, and on being introduced to Lord Belhaven I repeated to him what Lord De Saumarez had told me, and I asked him whether these facts were true—whether it was the case that the young officers had been tried by courts-martial by the senior subalterns, and that they had been very severely flogged; and I asked him, "Was your son one of those young officers, and did he suffer under this treatment?" Lord Belhaven said, "Yes." I considered, therefore, I was fully justified in telling the Secretary of State for War that Lord Belhaven corroborated the information given to me by Lord De Saumarez. He said to me, "I do not come to complain of Colonel Kinloch." I replied, "that may be the case," and I added, "It is sufficient for me that you have now corroborated what Lord De Saumarez has told me, and on your word, and on the word of Lord De Saumarez, I shall take up the matter officially." Then there was one letter which I see Lord Belhaven has referred to from Lord De Saumarez, but I also have a letter written, I think, on the same day, and there is a part of it which I will read. He said—

> "Charges were only comprehensible by explanation of regimental system, the fact of which Lord Belhaven has corroborated as regards his own son and others. Lord Belhaven also alluded to the harmless nature of the written protest against the system which he had himself drawn up. He expressly disclaimed the intention of making complaints as to his son's ill-treatment, having accepted the word of honour of Colonel Kinloch as to ignorance of the proceedings, though he had said in accepting Colonel Kinloch's statement that he must add that appearances were much against him."

Now, my Lords, I think you will all agree with me that I was perfectly justified in telling the Secretary of State for War that Lord Belhaven had corroborated the statement made to me by Lord De Saumarez.

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Five o'clock, to Thursday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 10*th March*, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Burgess Hill and St. John's Common Gas Bill; Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill; Fishguard and Rosslare Railways and Harbours Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill [by Order]; Great Northern and City Railway Bill [by Order]; Hampton Court Gas Bill [by Order]. Read a second time, and committed.

Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Bill [by Order]. Read a second time, and committed.

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Committee—

1 "That, in the case of the Metropolitan District Railway (Various Powers) Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Railway No. 1 be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

2. "That, in the case of the Wigan Corporation Tramways Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 2 and 4 be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

3. "That, in the case of the London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 8, 8A, 9, and 9A be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

4. "That, in the case of the Strabane and Letterkenny Railway Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

5. "That, in the case of the Sheffield Corporation Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 2 and 2A be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

6. "That, in the case of the Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1 and 2 be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

7. "That, in the case of the Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers contained in Clause 62 of the Bill, authorising the Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Company and the Great Northern Railway Com-

pany (Ireland) to subscribe to the undertaking, be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

8. "That, in the case of the Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway (*Substituted Bill*) Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that Clauses 28 and 29 be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

9. "That, in the case of the Croydon and District Electric Tramways Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 13A, 13B, 14, 15, and 16 be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

Resolutions agreed to.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (TRAMWAYS AND IMPROVEMENTS) BILL.

Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. John Burns and Colonel Nolan.

STRABANE AND LETTERKENNY RAILWAY BILL.

Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Sergeant Hemphill, Mr. Hugh Law, and Mr. M'Fadden.

PETITIONS.

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Gordon; Cromarty; and Inverkeithing; to lie upon the Table.

FRANCHISE AND REMOVAL OF WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL.

Petition from Hunslet, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING (SCOTLAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL, FOR ALTERATION, AND LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.

In favour: Petition from Paisley; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petitions against: from Tynemouth (two); Middlesbrough; and Newport Pagnell; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Bracknell; Sidcup; Lee; Wimbledon; and Enfield; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (WELSH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION ACT, 1889).

Copy presented, of Report of the Board of Education on the Administration of Schools, under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 66.]

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.

Copy presented, of Annual Report and Accounts of the Governors for the year 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC OFFICES (ACQUISITION OF SITE) ACT, 1895, SESSION 2; PUBLIC OFFICES (WESTMINSTER) SITE ACT, 1896; PUBLIC OFFICES (WHITEHALL) SITE ACT, 1897; AND PUBLIC BUILDING EXPENSES ACT, 1898.

Account presented, showing the moneys issued out of the Consolidated Fund, the moneys borrowed and the securities created in respect thereof, the disposal of moneys issued to the National Debt Commissioners for temporary investment, and the expenditure, under the provisions of the Acts, to the 31st March, 1902; together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 67.]

URBAN DISTRICTS (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "showing (1) the total rateable value of each of the urban districts in Ireland; (2) the borrowing powers of each, distinguishing between their powers under the Public Health

(Ireland) Act and Local Acts (if any); (3) the amount borrowed by each Urban District on the security of the rates, distinguishing loans from (*a*) Local Loans Fund, (*b*) Stock, (*c*) other sources (exclusive of loans entirely repaid on the 1st day of January 1902); (4) the amount of loans repaid up to the 1st day of January 1902 (exclusive of loans entirely repaid on the 1st day of January 1902); (5) the rate in the pound for all purposes levied in each Urban District during the years 1899, 1900, and 1901, and (6) the income (if any) of each Urban District from sources other than the rates."—(*Mr. O'Shee.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Education Act, 1902—School Trust Deeds.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education how many applications to vary the terms of school trust deeds have been received; how many applications for trust deeds for schools where no trust deeds previously existed; and in how many cases of new trust deeds, or varied trust deeds, approved by the Board of Education, a school formerly undenominational in respect of religious instruction has become associated with the religious formularies and teachings distinctive of a particular denomination.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) I assume that the Question refers to the period since the passing of the Education Act, 1902, and to elementary schools and to applications for schemes to amend trust deeds under the Charitable Trust Acts (through the powers transferred to the Board of Education under the Board of Education Act, 1899). The answer to the first and second Questions is that no such applications have been received; and to the third Question that no changes of the nature indicated have taken place.

Examination of Imported Milk.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): To ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that only eleven samples of imported fresh and sterilised milk were examined at the Government laboratories during the year 1902, that two of such samples of sterilised milk were found to be deficient in fat, and legal proceedings instituted in both cases; and that one of these cases was withdrawn on the importer undertaking to export the whole of the consignment reported against, and to cease importing such milk; and whether he will state what the proportion of the samples examined was to the total consignments of fresh and sterilised milk, and also the particulars of the analytical results of the two samples reported against, and the amounts of preservatives present.

(*Answered by Mr. Ritchie.*) Instructions were issued in ordinary course to officers of Customs to secure samples of fresh and sterilised milk imported during 1902, and in accordance therewith eleven samples were obtained and examined. In the first of the two cases in which sterilised milk was found deficient in fat satisfactory evidence was produced showing that the importer had no illegal intent, and that he would have stopped the importation if there had been time to do so; and the Board of Customs, on being assured that a similar illegality would not be repeated, waived proceedings upon payment of a fine of 40s. In the second case proceedings were taken and a conviction obtained. The total imports of fresh milk amounted to 13,559 cwts. during 1902, and of milk preserved (which includes, amongst other descriptions, sterilised milk) to 3,058 cwts. Arrangements were made with the concurrence of the Principal of the Government Laboratory at the beginning of the present year whereby a considerable number of samples of this class of article should be obtained in future.

Alien Lunatics at Tilbury Docks.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL TUFNELL (Essex, S.E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that alien lunatics are landed at Tilbury Docks and have become a charge on the guardians of the Orsett Union; and will he state whether he can take any steps in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I have made inquiry on this point, and am informed by the Clerk to the Orsett Guardians that there has been one alien lunatic landed at Tilbury Docks during the last six years. It is stated, however, that during this period seventeen other lunatics have been landed there, none of whom were chargeable to the Orsett Union. I understand that these cases have been adjudicated to the county or to other unions, or have recovered and been discharged before steps could be taken for this purpose. In all these cases the Guardians incurred some expense, which, as the Law stands, they do not appear to have been able to recover. I am not empowered to take any action in the matter.

Delay of Mails at Lerwick, etc.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): To ask the Postmaster General if his attention has been called to the fact that the steamer "St. Ninian" arrived at Scalloway on Tuesday, 24th February, and that no arrangements were made for landing the mail till 9 p.m., causing delay in delivery of mails at Lerwick; and will he state what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The steamer "St. Nicholas" (not the "St. Ninian" as stated in the Question) with mails from Aberdeen arrived off Scalloway at 3.10 p.m. on Tuesday the 24th of February, but owing to a strong gale she could not approach the pier nor could a boat reach her from the shore till about 9 p.m., when the mails were landed by boat. I am assured that they could not have been landed sooner with safety.

MR. CATHCART WASON: To ask the Postmaster General if the attention of the Government has been called to the fact that the mail steamer "St. Clair," timed to leave Scalloway with His Majesty's mails on Wednesday, 18th February, did not leave till Sunday the 22nd, and carried no mails; and will he state what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The mail steamer "St. Clair" arrived at Scalloway on Tuesday, the 17th of February, at 5.50 p.m., and afterwards proceeded as usual to Hillswick with a mail for that place, but she was unable to return to Scalloway in due course on Wednesday, the 18th of February, owing to stress of weather. She was obliged to take refuge at Aith Voe, and after making a second attempt to proceed next day, she was again compelled to return to Voe, where she had to remain until Sunday morning the 22nd. She then returned to Scalloway, and left there for the south on the same day. The only mail sent by the steamer on this occasion was the bag from Lerwick for Stromness, the mails for Aberdeen having been despatched by the direct steamer "Queen," which left Berwick at 8 a.m. on the 22nd.

Post Office Savings Bank—Promotions.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Postmaster General, whether, in view of the removal of the Post Office Savings Bank to West Kensington, the appointment of a telegraph staff, with consequent provision for supervision, has been considered; and whether the rate of promotion among the counter clerks and telegraphists of the London districts will be taken into consideration in making the superior appointments.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The Post Office Savings Bank will be in communication with the Central Telegraph Office by telephone, and will require no special telegraph staff.

Distress at Foula, Shetland.

MR. CATHCART WASON: To ask the Lord Advocate if he has any official reports showing that, owing to the inclement season, the oat crop at Foula was a failure last year, and that, consequently, the islanders have neither seed corn nor money to buy it; and if he will cause inquiry to be made with the view of affording them relief.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) No such reports, official or otherwise, have reached the Scottish Office.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Manning of the Fleet—Committee's Report.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can circulate to Members the Report of the Committee and the evidence taken by the Committee on the Manning of the Fleet, presided over by the right hon. Baronet the Member for Northumberland, or at least the Report, before the discussion on the Navy Estimates.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY, (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The Report of the Committee was presented to Parliament yesterday, and will be in the hands of hon. Members by the end of the week.

Boy Artificers in the Navy.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether his attention has been drawn to the dissatisfaction shown by the representations made to the Admiralty at the limitation of the right to sit for examination as boy artificer, under the new naval scheme, to sons of warrant officers, chief petty officers, and chargemen; and, if so, will he consider the possibility of revising the conditions so as to afford an equality of opportunity to the sons of all employees, irrespective of rank, rating, and trade.

MR ARNOLD-FORSTER: The arrangements made for the first entry of boy artificers were purely exceptional. In view of the fact that the ship was ready for the accommodation of the boys, and that it was most desirable to avoid any delay, a certain number of candidates for examination were selected from the classes named in the hon. Member's Question. From and after April next the entry of boy artificers will be by open competition, subject to the reservation of a few nominations for service candidates.

Immigration of Aliens.

MR. GOULDING (Wiltshire, Devizes): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that Section 3 of 6th William IV. empowers chief officers of Customs at ports of the United Kingdom to demand of all aliens arriving in this country a declaration of their names and places of origin, and the production of any passport of which they may be possessed, and that the enforcement of this Section has been allowed to fall into desuetude, though certain other provisions of the Act continue to be enforced; and whether, considering the number of alien immigrants who arrive from Russia and Roumania, and are obliged by their respective Governments to provide themselves with passports before leaving those countries, he will instruct the authorities to enforce Section 3 of the Act cited, and keep a register of such aliens as arrive from those countries with, and of such as arrive without, passports.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): It is true that under Section 3 of the Act 6 and 7, William IV., Cap. 11, aliens may be required to attend before the chief officer of Customs to make a declaration as indicated, but the information provided for by such declaration is already obtained in the shape of the declaration which the master of a vessel bringing aliens is required, under a penalty of £20, to furnish under Section 2 of the same Act. The accuracy of the latter declaration is checked by the officers of Customs attending the vessels on arrival, and no useful purpose would be served by requiring aliens to appear before the chief officer of Customs in person. Should it be thought desirable to record the number of aliens arriving with or without passports respectively, the Section referred to in the Question would enable the information to be obtained from the individual immigrants. It is, however, doubtful if the particulars thus obtained would be worth the trouble and expense of collection.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): Are the Government doing nothing to stop this scandal?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: What scandal?

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: This immigration without passports.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: This would not stop it.

Steam Launches "Wasp" and "Cockchafer."

Mr. KEARLEY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state the date of purchase, original cost, and amount since expended on maintenance of the two steam launches for the special repair of which a vote of £1,000 has recently been taken on Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The two launches referred to by the hon. Member are the "Wasp" and the "Cockchafer," stationed at Middlesbrough and Queenstown respectively. The former was purchased in 1876 and cost, when ready for service, £598. A sum of £2,941 was expended in maintenance (including repairs, stores, coal, etc.) during the twenty-six years up to the 31st January last. The latter was purchased in 1884 at a cost of £2,500, and a sum of £2,572 was expended in maintenance (including repairs, stores, coal, etc.) during the eighteen years up to 31st January last. The "Wasp" was not a new vessel when purchased, but the "Cockchafer" was built to the order of the Board of Trade.

Postal Rates to the United States.

Mr. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been called to the last Report of the United States Postmaster General, in which he recommends that the letter rate of postage between the United States and this country should be reduced; and, in view of the reply given to the hon. Member for South Hampshire, on 13th December, 1900, to the effect that His Majesty's Government had already proposed to the United States Government that a lower rate of postage should be established between the two countries, but that the United States Government was not then prepared to entertain the suggestion,† whether His Majesty's Government is now prepared to re-open negotiations with the United States Government on the subject.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.): Yes, Sir, I have seen the last Report of the Postmaster General of the United States of America, in which he recommends that negotiations be undertaken with Great Britain, Germany, and France, for the purpose of modifying the rates of postage. His Majesty's Government have not as yet received any proposals on the subject from the United States, but if such proposals are made they will receive our most careful consideration.

Telegraphic Errors—No Compensation.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been called to the loss incurred by Mr. Denis O'Sullivan, egg merchant, Killorglin, owing to a mistake made by a telegraph operator in forwarding prices; whether any compensation can be given for such loss; and whether he can take steps that such mistakes involving merchants in loss shall not be repeated.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: With regard to the first two questions I can only refer the hon. Member to the answer I gave him on the 25th ultimo.† With respect to the third, I fear it is impossible to ensure immunity from mistakes, but every possible care will be taken to avoid them.

Traction Engines on Public Roads.

Mr. C. E. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the accident which happened a fortnight ago to a hansom cab-driver and a gentleman inside the vehicle, at the top of Prince's Gate, caused by a traction engine and train of wagons; and whether, in view of other similar accidents, he can take steps, by legislation or otherwise, to protect the public from danger arising from such traction engines in open street and daylight.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): I believe several accidents have been caused by the traction engine referred to in the question, but I fear I have no power to interfere in the matter.

---

† See (4) *Debates,* lxxxviii., 697.

† See (4) *Debates,* cxvii., 799.

The regulation of the use of traction engines appears to be a matter for the County Council in the first instance under the Locomotives Act of 1898. It may be a question for the Royal Commission whether the provisions of this Act are sufficient.

MR. C. E. SCHWANN: But are not the regulations made by the Local Government Board?

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: The County Council make by-laws subject to the approval of the Local Government Board.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Have not the police power to prevent anything moving on the road to the common danger?

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: I am not aware that the police could have taken any action, as I have no information that the traction engine was infringing the law as to speed or otherwise.

In reply to a further question by Mr. SCHWANN,

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS said: The matter is not in my jurisdiction. I have gone further than I should have done out of courtesy to the hon. Member.

Clerks to Justices—Fees for Registration of Clubs.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that clerks to justices are making charges for work done in the registration of clubs under section 24 of the Licensing Act, 1902, beyond the fee of 5s. authorised by sub-section (6) of section 25, as, for instance, for filing, for supplying the form of return, for letters written, and for advice given; and whether he proposes to issue any scale of fees for such work so as to secure uniformity of practice in this matter.

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: No, Sir; I have not before me the facts of any case such as that indicated, and in the absence of information I cannot say whether it is a matter in which I could take action. It may be that, outside their official duties in this connection, clerks give assistance in respect of which they are entitled to make private arrangements.

MR. CORRIE GRANT: I will supply the right hon. Gentleman with the information.

Small-pox in Lancashire and Yorkshire.

SIR JOSEPH LEESE (Lancashire, Accrington): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the attention of the Local Government Board has been called to the outbreak of small-pox in many of the large centres of population of Lancashire and Yorkshire, and that the spread of the disease from town to town has been invariably found to be caused by persons of the tramp class; and whether the Board intend taking any, and, if so, what, action with the view of controlling or licensing the movements of persons of the tramp class as a precaution against the spread of small-pox and other infectious diseases.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.); I am quite aware of the outbreak of small-pox in the districts mentioned by the hon. Member. I do not think that the spread of the disease from town to town has been invariably caused by persons of the class referred to, but I am fully alive to the risk of diffusion of small-pox by this means. I am not in a position to take action of the kind contemplated in the last part of the Question; but I, last month, issued a circular letter to Boards of Guardians drawing their attention to the danger of infection being conveyed by tramps, and urging them to secure as far as practicable the vaccination or re-vaccination of all persons relieved in the Vagrant Wards, and to cause a daily medical inspection of all the inmates. I am also advising the sanitary authorities of the districts concerned, through the medical inspectors of my Department, as to the adoption of all practicable precautions against the spread of small-pox from this source.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): Can the right hon. Gentleman say how many cases there are in Liverpool at the present moment?

MR. WALTER LONG: Not without notice, but I will supply the hon. Member with the information.

Alien Paupers.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can obtain any information as to the number of aliens in receipt of relief in this country, and particularly in London.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am now obtaining particulars as to the number of aliens who received indoor or outdoor relief last year in London and certain other towns, and I hope shortly to be able to furnish my hon. and gallant friend with a statement on the subject. I also propose to obtain, in connection with the forthcoming 1st July Pauperism Return, particulars as to the number of aliens in receipt of relief on that day in the whole of England and Wales.

High Pavement Board School, Nottingham.

MR. CORRIE GRANT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he is aware that 150 children attending the High Pavement Board School, Nottingham, have been excluded from the main building owing to the new rules as to accommodation in higher elementary schools, and that they are now being taught temporarily in adjacent buildings; and whether, seeing that the Board of Education has refused to sanction this arrangement, suggesting that there is accommodation in All Saints National School, he will explain under what law or regulation the Board of Education propose a transfer of these scholars to a denominational school.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): The Nottingham School Board converted the High Pavement Higher Grade Board School into a Higher Elementary School with the sanction of the Board of Education. This rendered necessary the finding of school places elsewhere for a considerable number of children. The School Board proposed to fit up the laundry and gymnasium of the Higher Elementary School for this purpose. The Board of Education could not approve of the withdrawal of the laundry and gymnasium from the Higher Elementary School, more especially as there appeared to be vacant places in neighbouring schools, both board and voluntary, and notably in the All Saints National School. I may say that it has always been held that in dealing with questions of supply of school accommodation, the Board of Education, acting under the Education Acts, 1870–1900, have no authority to take into account the form of religious instruction which may be given in available schools.

Labourers' Cottages in Co. Limerick.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the application of Timothy O'Brien, of Ballyhobin, Ballybrood, County Limerick, for a cottage and plot of land under the Labourers Acts, on the farm of Roger Haynes, of Dunvullen, which was set aside at an ordinary meeting of the No. 1 Limerick District Council, was granted at the late inquiry, and his name returned in the inspector's report; and whether, seeing that the sanitary officer condemned this man's house as unsanitary, will he take steps to provide the cottage and plot.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The facts are as stated. The Board's inspector recommended a cottage and plot for O'Brien. A petition was lodged by Haynes against the proposal, which was then abandoned by the District Council. The cottage was consequently excluded from the Board's application for confirmation of the opposed portions of the Provisional Order. No further action can be taken at present, but it will be open to O'Brien to renew his application for a cottage on another site when the Council formulates a fresh scheme.

Irish Training Colleges.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that the cases of the training colleges in Dublin and of the provincial colleges are similar, and that the work done by the provincial training colleges is the same in kind in every respect, and subject to the test of identical examinations with that done in the denominational and undenominational colleges in Dublin, he will explain why the Treasury discriminate between the financial assistance given to the two sets of colleges; and whether, seeing that a free home is given to the Dublin colleges by a building loan, the interest on which is paid by an annual Vote in the Estimates, can he state whether there is anything in the Treasury rules to prevent the same being done in the case of the provincial training colleges.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The payment referred to at the end of the Question has been made since 1890 in accordance with an arrangement of that date between the Irish Government and the Treasury. The provincial colleges at Belfast, Waterford and Limerick have been established since 1890, and the arrangement of that year does not apply to them.

Irish Courts of Conscience.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether annual Returns are made from the Courts of Conscience in Ireland; and, if so, to whom are those Returns made; and will he state the number of cases tried in the Limerick Court in the year 1902, the gross amount sued for, and the amount recovered.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Annual Returns are made by the registrars of these Courts for the purpose of record in the volume of Judicial Statistics, periodically laid before Parliament. The number of cases heard in the Limerick Court in 1902 was 641. The gross amount sued for is not shown in the Return, but the amount recoverable is stated to be £484 1s. 0d.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): May I ask whether it is true, as reported, that the Irish Land Bill is to be introduced next week. I think a week's notice ought to be given, as many Members interested in the measure are away.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I will, of course, endeavour, and I think I can promise, to give a full week's notice. The exigencies of Supply make it impossible that the Bill should be introduced next week.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Then the rumour to which I have referred is not correct?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: If it were not for the amount of the financial business which we must get through before the end of the financial year, it might have been done; but it is impossible, and I very much regret it.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): When is the Speaker to be moved out of the Chair on the Navy Estimates?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: On Monday, I hope.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. Halsey reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had added to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, the following fifteen Members in respect of the Innkeepers' Liability Bill: — Mr. Bousfield, Mr. Broadhurst, Sir John Brunner, Mr. Vicary Gibbs, Mr. Goulding, Mr. Gretton, Sir Brampton Gurdon, Mr. Guthrie, Mr. Levy, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Charles Seely, Mr. Crawford Smith, Colonel Walker, Mr. Eugene Wason, and Mr. Patrick White.

Report to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILLS.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to the Housing of the Working Classes, and to establish fair rent courts," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. John Burns, Mr. Bell, Mr. Cremer, Captain Norton, Dr. Shipman, Mr. George White, and Mr. Stuart Samuel; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 2nd April, and to be printed. [Bill 90.]

TIED HOUSES (FREEING) BILL.

"To secure freedom for holders of licences for the sale of intoxicating liquor," presented by Mr. Rea; supported by Mr. Thomson, Mr. Yoxall, Mr. J. H. Whitley, Mr. Layland-Barratt, Mr. Bell, Mr. Soares, and Mr. Rigg; to be read a second time upon Friday, 3rd April, and to be printed. [Bill 91.]

SALMON FISHERIES (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Acts," presented by Sir Henry Seton-Karr; supported by Sir William Tomlinson, Mr. Atherley-Jones, Colonel Nolan, Colonel Saunderson, and Mr. Yerburgh; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, March 31st, and to be printed. [Bill 92.]

LANDS VALUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To amend The Lands Valuation (Scotland) Act, 1854," presented by Mr. M'Crae; supported by Mr. Bryce, Sir John Leng, Sir William Dunn, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. John Dewar, and Dr. Robert Wallace; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 5th May, and to be printed. [Bill 93.]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Committee of Public Accounts do consist of Fifteen Members."—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

*SIR CHARLES DILKE appealed to the Government, if the appointment of the Committee were agreed to, not to press the nomination of its members that day. The Committee had lost the services of the hon. Member for King's Lynn, than whom no member of the Committee had done better public service. The Committee would regret losing him. Under these circumstances they ought to have time to consider the names proposed, especially as there were one or two Members, formerly active and useful members of the Committee, who had been out of the House for some time, but had now returned and whose names ought to be considered along with those of younger members.

SIR ALEXANDER ACLAND-HOOD assented to the suggestion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That the Committee of Public Accounts do consist of Fifteen Members.

SUPPLY (ARMY ESTIMATES).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question (9th March), "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for Committee on Army Estimates, 1903–4."

Question again proposed:

Debate resumed.

*MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I think the House will agree that there has been a most salutary change made in the form of our discussion on the Motion that you, Sir, do leave the Chair. If I rightly apprehend the case we have returned permanently to the old practice of allowing those Members who succeed in the ballot to introduce their Motions at the commencement of the debate and of permitting a general discussion before the Minister in charge of the Estimates makes his statement. That, I say, is a salutary change in our practice, and I hope the same course will be pursued when the Navy and Civil Service Estimates come before us. The right hon. Gentleman has circulated a statement with regard to the Estimates as to which I can only say we should have been glad if it had been fuller. May I suggest that the more ample statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty is better calculated to meet our requirements? And if the right hon. Gentleman had gone on the same lines we should have approached this important discussion much better armed than we now are. Now, no one in this House has yet expressed what must be the feeling of everybody outside with regard to these Estimates. There is universal disappointment outside the House at their amount. They seem to be the most extravagant Estimates ever presented, although they are presented at a time when we had hoped that the circumstances were such as to enable striking reductions to be made. Both the first and the second Papers circulated by the right hon. Gentleman are not only meagre but, as I think, a little misleading. While he has circulated an Estimate which amounts to what in a time of peace cannot be otherwise described than as astonishing—for it reaches a figure of £34,500,000—he makes a disingenuous effort to prove that the normal Estimates amount to only £27,500,000. I complain of that. I do not think it is the case, and I do not think it is right to suggest that there is any prospect in the future of a reduction such as that which the right hon. Gentleman hints may take place. I complain of the use of the word "normal"; it is not legitimate. What is the meaning of the word? It means "usual and customary, and not swollen by any extraordinary circumstances." The Estimates with which the right hon. Gentleman has compared his figures for this year are not of a normal character.

The Estimates of last year were produced in the midst of a war panic, and were accordingly swollen beyond precedent. So indeed the Army Estimates of the last two or three years had been swollen by a similar panic, and nobody has been inclined to put any obstacles in the way of the right hon. Gentleman in regard to any expenditure which may have been deemed necessary during the existence of the crisis. We ought, therefore, to go back to the year before the war in order to get the normal Estimates. I take the year 1899 as being a normal one. The Estimates then amounted to 20·6 millions, and even they were the largest Estimates that had ever been presented to this House in time of peace for the purposes of the Army. I say it is with these Estimates that the right hon. Gentleman should make comparison, if he desires to compare his present Estimates with the normal military expenditure. If we take that year, there is not only an astounding difference in the total amount of the cost, but there are one or two features about the present Estimate which must strike the House as most extraordinary. In that year the total number of men provided for was 184,000. This year the number is 235,000. This gives an increased number of 27½ per cent. But when we come to look at the amount of money demanded, we find that the increase is no less than 66 per cent., so that we have not only a much larger Army than I think we ought to have, but the cost of the Army is disproportionately great. Every item is totally out of proportion. Take that of pay; four years ago it amounted to 6·1 millions, now it is 9·6 millions—an increase of 57 per cent. Then take Votes 3, 4 and 5, which cover the Militia, Yeomanry and Volunteers. There we have an increase of 110 per cent. In provisions the increase is over 100 per cent., and in transport it is 167 per cent. These are perfectly astounding figures, and they show that in four years we get an increase, which many think is not required, of 27½ per cent. in the strength of the Army, and of from 70 to 100 per cent. in its cost. If the demand had been made on the old basis of cost, the right hon. Gentleman might have asked not for 235,000 men, but for 320,000 men, and, therefore, I say that the figures which he has presented are of a most astounding character. I suggest further that it was hardly fair to speak of £27,500,000 as the normal expenditure, because in his statement the right hon. Gentleman treated separately certain items connected with South Africa, Somaliland, etc., and it was only by taking out those items that he succeeded in reducing his Estimates. He has only gilded the pill that we may swallow it without complaint. I put this question to the right hon. Gentleman. Does he suggest that he will be able to reduce the Estimates to £27,500,000 next year or the year after? If not, the whole argument set forth in the statements he has circulated is misleading. If we can get a statement from the Government that this is a swollen Estimate, which will not be repeated, and that in future we shall not go above £27,000,000, then indeed we may view the situation with more content than we can in face of the figures now presented. But is there any real hope that a serious decrease such as the right hon. Gentleman indicates can take place in this great expenditure?

I am glad to see that *The Times*, the most sturdy supporter of the Government in this country, has taken alarm at its proceedings with regard to Army expenditure. The moment the Estimates appeared it attacked them in a very powerful leading article, and expressed what I think is the feeling of all classes of society in every part of the country with regard to them. I took the trouble to read that leading article very carefully, and I noted in it seven substantial reasons, none of which are referred to in the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, which will make reduction impossible. *The Times* criticises the Government for not making some provision for items of expenditure with which the country is threatened. First there is the introduction of a new rifle, and no provision whatever is made for the expense in that respect, which certainly will have to be met in the immediate future. Then there is the completion of the Army Corps system. The Government cannot withdraw that scheme, and it will involve considerable extra expenditure. At the beginning of 1904 there is to be an increase of pay representing 6d. per day to the troops. How can that be met without maintaining the existing figures? Then in the course of yesterday's debate several hon. Members put forward strong claims for an increased expenditure on the Volunteers. Again no additional sum is provided for the improvement of the Intelligence Department, the one branch of Army expenditure in regard to which everybody is agreed that something more must be done. The Education Vote is left in an unsatisfactory state, and no provision is made for the additional training ing grounds and barracks that may be required. This paper, usually such a loyal supporter of the Government, suggests that, for all these reasons, it will be impossible for the Government to realise the economies which they are leading the House to expect, and it says we may take it that £34,500,000 will be the normal expenditure which the country will have to face in future for its Army. It would be better, then, for the Government to make a clean breast of it, and say that these are the Estimates which they think will be necessary for the Army.

During the last year or two the Army and Navy Estimates have practically been of the same amount, and we are now face to face with a very grave situation, which should cause the House some reflection. Can we continue to face it with equanimity? I will quote one or two authorities. I think the highest authority we now have is the Colonial Secretary. At the recent Colonial Conference he drew attention to the fact that our annual expenditure for military and naval purposes represented 29s. 3d. per head of population, and he contrasted it with the expenditure of other nations. Were he here to-day what would he say to the proposal of the Government, which brings the expenditure up to 34s. per head? Speaking of the smaller sum, the right hon. Gentleman said no one would believe that the United Kingdom could for all time make that inordinate sacrifice. What would he say about 34s. per head? Compare our expenditure with that of other nations, and remember at the same time the position we occupy, being surrounded as we are by sea and not having to protect extensive land frontiers. The expenditure of France is 21s. per head, of Germany 15s. per head, and of Russia 7s. per head. These are the great Powers with which the comparison should be made, for they are the Powers with which we are engaged in desperate business rivalry. And when the comparison is made I think it must be admitted that the burden thrown upon us is far too great, and that no Government should lightly seek to increase it. Now, I will quote another authority, that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife. He has declared that a large Army is nothing but a costly, wasteful, and foolish luxury. On some points of expenditure the right hon. Gentleman does not agree with me, but in this respect I do not think he could have used happier words.

Finally I would call the attention of the House to a series of four articles which appeared in *The Times*. The conclusion at which the very able writer arrived is summed up in two sentences. He says that our present normal expenditure of over £30,000,000 on the Army is far in excess both of our military requirements and of our national resources, and if a certain policy which he suggests were adopted, an immediate reduction to £24,000,000 might be effected. Instead of a reduction to £24,000,000, we have an increase to £34,000,000, and therefore I say that the situation is one of great gravity. I might refer to the excellent speech delivered not long ago by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer at Bristol. There is no man to whom the Government or the country ought to be more indebted for his courageous efforts to meet the financial difficulties caused by the War. He is no longer Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I heartily wish he were here to express his opinion. At Bristol he dealt with the new Estimates in advance, and he said there was no reason for an increase of the normal expenditure on the Army. He also suggested there was no reason for increased naval expenditure, yet the Government are proposing an increase in both directions. I am not a specialist in these matters, and I know nothing about naval expenditure, but I think the general sense of the House of Commons is about level with my own in regard to these questions. I say we ought to control the expenditure, and I think some good work has been done by hon. Members opposite in recent debates, and especially in the country, by the hon. Member for Oldham, in the discussion of these matters. But in some of these discussions we give ourselves away to the right hon. Gentleman who is in charge of the Estimates, and we do so by discussing the methods of reduction and other details. The moment this House goes into these details it delivers itself over to the Minister in charge, who is able to produce figures —often very suspicious figures—and to quote the opinions of his advisers on these technical questions against our views. We ought to confine ourselves, therefore, to finance. We ought to say the country cannot afford this huge outlay, and we ought to call upon the Government to reduce it.

I often wonder what atmosphere the Government live in, and if they are to be found in the ordinary walks of mankind. If they were they would know that there is a very gloomy feeling abroad with regard to our national expenditure. We are at the end of a sort of season in business, which lasts from October till April, when new industrial enterprises are presented to the public for financial support. But there has been no season at all this year, because there is no money in the country. You cannot get money for any industrial enterprises, because of the huge claims the Government continue to make. While the war lasted, and while the grave incidents which marked its unfortunate course were occurring, the nation was ready to make any sacrifice. But now the war is over it finds we are being plunged into worse experiments of taxation and apparently into a larger expenditure, and it is by no means content. The public might fairly expect a reduction of expenditure in place of the swollen Army Estimates which have been presented to this House. Perhaps nothing can be done this year, but I think if hon. Members will agree with the Colonial Secretary that this is a burden the nation cannot continue to bear for all time, and with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife that it is a costly and foolish experiment, and will express its concurrence in those views, no Government will be able to refuse to listen to it.

*Mr. WYLIE (Dumbartonshire): I wish to make a few remarks with reference to the grievances of the Volunteer force and the unsatisfactory replies given in regard thereto by the representatives in this House of the War Office. I was surprised to hear my noble friend the Financial Secretary make the statement that, because a Royal Commission was to be appointed in connection with the Volunteer movement, the subject ought not to be discussed in this House. I do not agree with that, because a Parliamentary discussion prior to the sittings of a Royal Commission has frequently widened the scope of the reference to that Commission, and has in many cases given such indications of the willingness of the House to pay for certain schemes as to have guided them in their findings, and done much to induce the House to give practical effect to the recommendations eventually made by the Commission. I have given notice of a Motion in connection with the Volunteer force which has been approved by a large number of Volunteer officers throughout the country, and I am therefore speaking in the name of many officers on the active list. The Prime Minister, in the brilliant and convincing speech which he made to justify a very large increase of the land forces, necessitated by our contact with Foreign Powers, stated that in the three Army Corps for home defence we should find, as far as infantry are concerned, there will be fourteen battalions supplied by the Regulars and sixty-one by the Volunteers, while of cavalry regiments, five will be supplied by the Regulars and ten by the Volunteers. He said we may all, therefore, agree that it is on the citizen Volunteer force that we have to depend for national defence. Thus an exceedingly important position has been authoritatively assigned to the Volunteer forces, a position in some respects the most important of all, for whilst we look upon the Navy as our first line of defence, but we look on the Volunteers as our last line, and, if they fail, then all is lost. I wish to ask what treatment has been given to this force to which such an important function has been assigned. The Secretary of State and the Financial Secretary have justified recent measures, mainly by the statement that they are about to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the Volunteer and Militia forces. But the fact remains that whilst they have materially increased the strength of the Regular Army, the Militia, and the Yeomanry, they have as deliberately planned a decrease of the Volunteers, by exacting from them longer and more arduous services without corresponding allowances and facilities.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I must protest against that statement. It is absolutely contrary to the fact. The regulations now imposed on Volunteers were proposed by a Committee on which I sat, and on which the Members of the War Office were in a minority, the majority being members of the Volunteer force, and it is by the unanimous decision of the Committee that the regulations were issued.

*MR. WYLIE: I am speaking on behalf of a large number of Volunteer colonels who are still in active service.

*LORD STANLEY: So were the members of this Committee.

MR. WYLIE: They were selected from these. The Amendment to the Address which I put on the Paper, was unanimously adopted by a meeting of eighty Volunteer colonels. The Secretary of State took great credit last night for what he called the enormously increased expenditure on the Volunteer forces—£1,720,000. But it is only about 2 per cent. of the total expenditure on our defensive forces, or 30 per cent. less than the cost of two battleships, or less than the cost of 20,000 Regulars. If the War Office, when they asked for increased services from the Volunteers, had increased the allowances, not by a large sum, but to the extent of £250,000, it would have been regarded by the Volunteers as an admirable acknowledgment of the splendid services rendered by them in the field, and with satisfaction by the nation at large. There is yet time for the War Office to repair the error they have committed, and I would, with diffidence, but with the approval and authority of a very large number of Volunteer officers, venture to make certain suggestions. The first is that the camp regulations should be so modified that during the whole summer camps should be continually in existence.

LORD STANLEY: They already are. There are camps in existence throughout the season at which officers and men can earn their grant.

*MR. WYLIE: The alterations in the regulations have been so numerous that I cannot be expected to be posted in all the details. If what the noble Lord says is correct, and men are able to go into camp to put in their drills who have not been able to go with their various battalions, one of the strongest objections to the new regulations will have been removed. Then the minimum camp allowance should not be less than 5s. The hon. Member for East Edinburgh referred to this point last night, and showed the great amount of jealousy which exists between the Army Corps Volunteers and the Volunteers who are not so privileged. The selection of Army Corps Volunteers is in some respects arbitrary. I know of one battalion which is a better battalion than that attached to the Army Corps, but which receives only 2s. 6d., while——

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The Army Corps battalion have fourteen days' camp, which is a very serious demand to make upon them, whereas other battalions have only seven.

*MR. WYLIE: I am aware of that, and should be pleased for the allowance to the Army Corps battalions to be increased, but there should not be a less allowance than 5s. for any Volunteer going into camp.

In connection with rifle ranges and ammunition, I am glad the War Office have been taking up the question of ranges more energetically, but there is still room for improvement. As to ammunition, the Volunteers receive 90 rounds per annum, while the Regulars have 250 rounds; and a new regulation has been issued to the effect that 70 of the 90 rounds must be fired in camp, leaving only 10 rounds for matches and 10 rounds for coaching inferior shots. Anyone can see that this allowance is absolutely insufficient for the proficiency now demanded. The Commander-in-Chief has intimated that marksmanship is the principal qualification for the soldier, and if the Volunteers are to be put in a proper position in this respect, their amount of ammunition should be increased to a minimum of 150 rounds, or still better, 180 rounds.

Then there should be a more liberal arrangement in connection with drill halls. In country districts, especially, the battalions should be assisted to have a drill hall in every village. I would also strongly urge that the mounted infantry should be reinstated in the grants of which they have been deprived. The experiment of the War Office, in regard to the mounted infantry connected with the various infantry battalions, was most successful, and, if persevered in, would have had the effect of drawing into the force a very large number of mounted men as efficient, in many respects, as the Yeomen, but not more than half as expensive. The grants to the cycle corps, too, should be restored to the £2 originally granted.

These modifications would involve an expenditure certainly not greater than £250,000, which would be cheerfully granted by the House, and would, I think, give satisfaction to the country at large. I hope the scope of the reference to the Royal Commission will not be limited to the immediate necessities of the Volunteers, but will include the question of a very large extension of the Volunteer forces, so that they should be commensurate with the needs of the Empire. The Prime Minister, the other night, urged the proximity of Russia to our North-West Indian Frontier as an important reason for the great extension of our land forces he was then defending. But there are other countries—France and Germany—to whom we are in close proximity by land, and if there should be a combination of those countries against us, or if Russia should attack us, the principal inducement for them to do so would be the profound contempt which they entertain for the very small number of our land forces. Two years ago I was speaking to a Russian staff officer, and I was amazed at the frank expression of opinion which he gave on this subject, and I know that the same opinion is prevalent among the officers of other countries, particularly France and Germany. We know that the idea is erroneous and without foundation, but the very fact that it exists is a constant menace to the peace of the Empire. So much has this been recognised that there is growing up in the country a strong feeling in favour of conscription. The hon. Member for East Edinburgh last night admitted the fact——

MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I really must interrupt the hon. Member; I said nothing of the kind.

*MR. WYLIE: I think the hon. Member said he would like to see compulsory service imposed on all men in the country.

MR. McCRAE: What I said was that every young man capable of bearing arms should do a certain amount of training so as not to interfere with his ordinary avocation—which is a very different thing from conscription.

*MR. WYLIE: It is a modified form of conscription; but I beg the hon. Member's pardon if I misrepresented him, though I may say that other Members on this side had the impression that it was an admission in favour of conscription. At any rate, I am justified in saying that there has been a feeling in favour of conscription growing up. ["No."] I will give an instance. The hon. Member for Flintshire, a strong advocate of "peace, retrenchment, and reform," while living on the Continent last winter was so impressed by the Anglophobia prevalent that he wrote a letter to *The Times* strongly advocating universal conscription. Lord Wemyss has resigned his connection with the Volunteer force because the Government have not adopted what I consider to be a very objectionable form of conscription, viz., the Militia Ballot. Then there has been formed the National Defence League, which is——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The question of conscription does not arise on the Estimates. It would require legislation, and what requires legislation cannot be now discussed.

*MR. WYLIE: I was rather led away by the interruptions of hon. Members. In conection with the Volunteers I may say that the National Defence League has two objects—one of which is that drill should be an obligatory subject in all schools, with which I quite agree. Such a system would greatly improve the physique of the youth of the country——

*MR. SPEAKER: This would arise on the Education Estimates rather than the Army Estimates.

*MR. WYLIE: To come to the immediate purpose of my remarks. I believe that with very little encouragement the Volunteer forces could be enormously increased in number, say to 600,000, with a reserve of 500,000, and a second reserve of 1,500,000, at a cost out of all proportion less than the sum of money expended on any other branch of the service. What I would suggest is that the capitation grant should be increased from 35s. to a minimum of 50s., rising to 60s. as a maximum according to the various degrees of efficiency. The success of the War Office in regard to the Yeomanry has been very greatly due to the fact that the yeoman when he leaves his training goes home with £6 or £7 in his pocket as compensation for the amount of work that he has lost, and for the services he has given to his country. If this principle were to apply to a much more limited extent to the Volunteers, so that those who have been a week in camp would be able to save not less than £1 or 25s., and those in camp a fortnight not less than £3, then the number of Volunteers who would be induced to join would be far greater than anything yet achieved. In this way Volunteer officers have told me that the prospect of which my hon. friend the Financial Secretary spoke, of inducing an unlimited number of Volunteers to join would be fulfilled.

In connection with the training of the Volunteers there should be a paid sergeant major and a quartermaster sergeant, and, above all, there should be a permanent staff at the War Office for the purpose of managing Volunteer forces, and in sympathy with them. If these various conditions were complied with I have no doubt the Volunteer forces would be enormously increased in numbers and efficiency. Such a scheme as I have indicated could only be carried out by the Government, although it might be initiated by the War Office. I am glad to know that upon this Committee of Imperial Defence there will be the Prime Minister and three other Cabinet Ministers, and I hope that after the Royal Commission has given its Report an enormous enlargement of the Volunteer forces will be one of the principal objects which will come before the Imperial Committee of Defence. During the last twenty years there has been a gradual awakening as to our responsibility in regard to the Empire which has caused many in the country to advocate a very large increase in our land forces. Some such scheme as I have advocated, and which has been advocated by so many practical men throughout the country, would commend itself to the peace party as the surest means of averting war and conscription, which otherwise must assuredly come. It would also commend itself to the association for the supply of food in time of war as the cheapest form of insurance against war. It would commend itself to social reformers as one of the best means of securing the physical development of the youth of this nation; and it would also commend itself to the whole Empire as an enormous addition to its defensive power, and as thoroughly in accord with the traditions and instincts of the British people, which are entirely in favour of a purely voluntary service.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I do not wish to follow the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down in any of those controversies into which he entered with various Members on both sides of the House. I welcome the spirit in which he spoke of the Volunteer movement, and I welcome the assurance he gave us that, in his opinion, the home defence of the United Kingdom ought to be entrusted less to Regular troops than to the civilian Army, a doctrine which appears to me to be growing in strength every day. On the Volunteer question I for one would be prepared to go beyond the present system as regards the payment made to these Volunteer forces. I do not myself see why a Volunteer force should be even in part a gratuitous force. So far as a civilian force could be enrolled and organised I should be prepared myself to defend the system which made compensation in full for all the time and labour that each individual member of this force gave to his country. But I have risen less for the purpose of alluding to this question than for the purpose of saying how I entirely sympathise with the protest which has been made to-day by my hon. friend the Member for Islington, and which has been so effectively made by him against the enormous expenditure involved in these Estimates. Along with the cry for a citizen and a civilian army has been raised the cry for retrenchment and economy, and this cry has been made outside and inside the House of Commons on all occasions but on the Estimates. On the Estimates the cry is always for further expenditure; and, sympathising as I do with the demand for economy, I, for one, cannot resist giving my support to-day to the protest raised by my hon. friend.

If we mean to do anything in this matter we ought to tackle every Estimate in turn, and have the courage of our convictions by voting against all expenditure which we believe to be excessive. We were talking the other day about the Joint Committee of Defence, as it is called, the main object of which is to secure that the Army and Navy should be considered together, not as two independent forces, but as two branches of the same force. Sir, I wish this principle could be applied to our discussions in this House. We are the real Committee of Defence, and we ought to be able to consider the Army and the Navy together in regard to their demands on the public purse. That is not possible for us to do, and I can only make a very bare allusion to Estimates which represent, not the Army, but the Navy expenditure, showing an enormous increase upon the already enormous amount which the country is spending. I do not give that as a reason why I should vote against any particular item in the Army Estimates this year; but I do say the tremendous sum that is being asked for for the Navy increases and intensifies the necessity that we should enforce economy in every possible particular in the Army Estimates. If there is to be any choice, everyone will agree that preference should be given to the Navy. Everybody will admit that there must be a limit to the military expenditure of this country. I think we are very near to the extent of our resources; and, if economy must take place, then the first arm to economise must not be the Navy but the Army. I want to put in a sentence or two about this system which is embodied in the Estimates now before us. It is the most concise and the most comprehensive that I have ever seen. I am going to quote the deliberate language used by the Secretary of State for War, speaking on behalf of the Government, including the first Lord of the Admiralty, and addressing the Colonial Premiers. In no document is this view so well set out. Here is what the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "We are prepared—and our organisation enables us in the future—to send 120,000 British troops abroad to any part of the British Empire which may be threatened. We keep up a home field army of another 120,000 men; we keep another 190,000 men for our garrisons; we have a large number—somewhere between 100,000 and 200,000—employed in various positions for the defence of London and for strategic positions which might be threatened in case of

invasion. But, large as these preparations may sound, they are certainly not deemed too large by our military advisers, in view of the possibility of our at any time losing command of the sea; and I would venture to remind the Conference that what Great Britain does off her own bat towards the defence of the colonies and dependencies, is not limited by her power to send 120,000 men to any threatened position in case of emergency. We have close upon 80,000 British troops in India. We have always some in the colonial garrisons, and at present—and probably for some time longer to come—we must, in view of South Africa, look to keeping a larger number than that. Therefore we have, either abroad at this moment or liable to go abroad on any emergency, close upon 250,000 men.

That is the account which the right hon. Gentleman gives of the system he is asking us to pay for in these Estimates, and I gather that the noble Lord opposite approves of the sentiments so expressed. There are one or two things to be said about that statement. I will not repeat what has been said about the hypothesis upon which the whole thing is said to be based, namely, the possibility of our losing command of the sea. I do not think that is possible even if the Navy Estimates were not so high. I see nothing in that, but I do express my surprise that the First Lord of the Admiralty should have assented to this proposition being laid down in his name. There is one *caveat* I wish to enter. The right hon. Gentleman told the Conference that his Estimates are approved of and settled by the advice of those whom he calls his military advisers. That, as we know, is the regular official answer to any criticism of any kind on the Estimates.

I want the House to consider for a moment what is the legitimate function of the military, and I would say also of the naval, advisers, with respect either to Army or Navy finance. The authority of these professional advisers is undoubted, and nobody would be more ready to admit it than myself in certain specific matters. In all matters of detail that ought to be conclusive. Take the Army case. The kind and amount of ammunition, the amount of cordite that ought to be in stock, is a question on which the opinion of the military authorities ought to be conclusive. I think that a Minister of War who on such a question came to us and said that he had acted upon the advice of his military advisers would give a complete answer to unofficial criticisms. In the same way, on a technical thing like the kind of boilers to be used in the Navy, I think the First Lord of the Admiralty for the time being amply protects himself if he acts on the authority of his professional advisers. But when it comes to be a question of what is to be the size of the Army, or what is to be the size of the Navy, what is to be the military or naval expenditure, I venture to assert in presence of this House that the military and naval advisers have no conclusive authority. They have no more authority than a private citizen ought to have who has intelligently studied the subject, because the size of the Navy, and the number of the Army, depend upon policy with which those gentlemen have no special concern. I am not speaking particularly of foreign policy, but other matters of policy, such as those laid down in the statement, from which I have quoted, by the right hon. Gentleman. He says, for instance, that 120,000 men are being maintained in the Regular Army as a weapon for the defence of the whole Empire, and for the defence in particular of the self-governing colonies. But the question, for instance, whether the people of the United Kingdom ought to go on bearing, as they have to bear now, not only the whole burden of naval defence, but also a large burden for the military defence of the self-governing colonies, is one of policy which a soldier has no more authority on than a private Member of this House. That is the position, I take it, and that is the point I want to make, and apparently the right hon. Gentleman does not dissent from that proposition. If that is so, I do not see why he is entitled to say that his military advisers support the policy which he says lies at the bottom of the statement made to the Colonial Conference. It is to safeguard myself against the assumption that the admirals and the generals have any right to dictate to this country, and also to safeguard the House, that I venture to make these observations.

The right hon. Gentleman in the statement I have quoted, and which statement contains the true theory of the Estimates, has specified as the objects of them the various things I have mentioned. I object to what he says with regard to the Estimates, and I want to give one or two specific reasons why I should be prepared to vote for any Motion for cutting down the Estimates. First of all, I am an entire convert to the theory, expounded with great success on the other side of the House, as well as this, that the maintenance of a huge Army for the home defence of this country is insane, and that we ought to throw ourselves upon the enthusiasm and the patriotism of our fellow citizens for the defence of the home shores, and, as I said before, I would make that as little burdensome to the individual voluntary citizen as possibly could be done. I think it would be an economical expenditure to pay him all his outlay and to compensate him for his services as well. Home defence should be the business of the private citizen, and I shall be prepared to give my strenuous support to every Motion for that purpose.

However, when it comes to maintaining a great Regular Army in order to feed the Indian Army I object. India pays pretty fully for the uses of the Army at present. I believe that to be true. If you exclude India from the rest of the Empire, what you have got to defend consists mainly, at all events, of the great self-governing colonies. The articles in *The Times* to which my hon. friend referred, seem to countenance the theory that home defence should be reserved for a citizen Army. The writer advocated a system whereby a considerable Regular Army should be maintained on Navy lines for Imperial defence. That was the thesis of *The Times* writer. And if that be so, and that must be his meaning, we are to be asked in this House to maintain 120,000 men, not specially for India, but for the whole Empire, of which the self-governing colonies form one-fifth. In trade, numbers, and wealth the self-governing colonies are in the proportion of one to four of us. If in addition to finding them their Naval defence, with nothing but a fabulous contribution from them, we are to be called upon to find military defence also to the extent of 120,000 men, then I say that is not a question for generals, it is a question for this House; the same difficulty arises as the Colonial Secretary has discovered in the case of the Navy, namely, the difficulty of forcing upon the people of the United Kingdom this enormous expenditure, in the benefits of which the self-governing colonies share equally with ourselves, but to which these colonies do not contribute one single farthing. Any Motion, therefore, which has for its object to raise the question of the policy of our continuing this system of finance would have my support, unless a stronger case is made out than the Government have made out so far. I would be prepared to take as to the Army the same line which I have taken for so many years in regard to naval defence, that, namely, of resisting this extreme demand which the self-governing colonies make in connection with a force which is maintained for their protection as well as our own.

The only other point to which I wish to refer is this. I am willing to bear my part in supporting all necessary and justifiable expenditure on the Army as well as the Navy, but I should like to be well assured in the case of the Army and in the case of the Navy that we are getting full value for whatever money we may expend on either service. In the case of the Army one cannot shut one's eyes to certain obvious and notorious facts. You have an Army which, as compared with the Navy, might fairly be described, without offence to anybody—nothing is further from my mind than that—as consisting very largely of a ceremonial and ornamental, as distinguished from a business body. If there is any comparison to be made in these services I think public opinion holds that the Navy is the more serious of the two in all its departments. If I were assured that there was complete equality in the two services in this respect one of my objections to these Estimates would disappear. Let me take the expense of one item. I see in the Estimates that it costs £26 a year or more, to clothe a new recruit in one of the regiments of His Majesty's Army, and it costs £15 a year to keep his uniform all right. I do not think it is a fair business expenditure. [AN HON. MEMBER: "What regiment?"] It is one of the Guards. There are a number of them in a similar position, and that is only one. I think that is the highest. I forget which regiment. This is evidently an ornamental expenditure, at all events as compared with similar expenditure in the case of the Navy.

LORD STANLEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman give the exact name of the regiment?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I will give it to the noble Lord when I have sat down. I have not got it here. I will not dwell on that point, but there is one other I should like to say a word upon. I should like to think that the avenue of admission to the rank of officer in the Army was as open to all capable citizens as in the case of the Navy. In the case of the Army it is not so open. It is barred in the Navy, but to a comparatively small degree, by the extravagance—I do not know that that is the correct word—but by the excess of expenditure over income, and by the system of nomination. In the case of the Army it appears that the Secretary of State for War has done next to nothing to fulfil the pledges he made three years ago, when the first disasters of the war began to affect public opinion in this country. We know perfectly well that what he has done does not make it possible for a young officer to live on his pay.

MR. BRODRICK was understood to say that it was the same in the armies of other countries.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I do not know that it is. How about the United States? In the case, at all events, of the United States Navy—and I have no doubt in the case of the Army also—from the moment a young naval cadet enters the United States Naval School he receives a salary which is sufficient to pay his entire expenses, and however rich his parents may be they are not allowed to send him any money for his expenses. That is a system I should like to see introduced into the Army as well as the Navy. No one will pretend that it exists at the present moment. The right hon. Gentleman, speaking on this point the other day, gave this extraordinary defence of the present system. He said that in every profession the expenses of the early years are greatest. But the Army is not a profession, and the Navy is not a profession. In open professions adventurers of all kinds take their chance. They may have money or they may not. They may get immediate occupation or none, but is that system to be applied to the services of the nation? Surely it is our business on behalf of the State to seek for the most capable young fellows who can make their way into the Army as officers. If you make their nominal salary so much lower than their necessary expenditure, then only rich men can enter the Army, and you deprive yourselves of the services of 90 per cent. of the possibly capable people in the country. I am sure that the House has long ago made up its mind on that point. I, for one, would be prepared to resist any expenditure on an Army the commissioned ranks of which are deliberately kept apart from the people, and only retained for rich people. The noble Lord scoffs, but probably he has not read the Report of his own Military Education Committee. I do not agree that the composition of that Committee was satisfactory. It was composed of Army representatives, and the heads of great public schools and other interests were ignored. But even they could not deny that in the Cavalry a private income of from £500 to £700 over and above his pay was necessary to enable an officer to live. Surely that proves my case. The noble Lord defends even that! A remarkable instance was revealed in the evidence given before the Committee. One of the witnesses reported a case in which in an examination for Cavalry commissions the total number of marks was fixed at 20,000. There was one candidate who got 168 marks! If the number of marks had been represented by the ordinary number of 100, I suppose the marking of that candidate would have been three quarters of a mark! He got his commission nevertheless. Does the noble Lord approve of that?

LORD STANLEY: If he did well in war I do not disapprove of it.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Doing well in war comes after his admission into the Army, and examination, as I understand, is a test of capacity to enter the Army I do not think the noble Lord would justify a system such as that. Of course that is an extreme case; and the necessity of having a private income of from £500 to £700 over and above pay only applies to the Cavalry. But is there a single regiment in His Majesty's service—not being a regiment on the Indian Establishment—in which a young officer can live on his pay? If there is not, then I say the capable young men of the country are excluded from the Army, and I shall adopt every chance I have of voting against it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: May I make an appeal to the House to agree to the Motion that Mr Speaker do now leave the Chair? The House is aware that until the Motion is agreed to my right hon. friend cannot make his statement before proceeding to the very important matters that have to be discussed this evening. Let me add, as an inducement to the House if possible to pass on to the next stage, that it is absolutely necessary in the interests of public business that we should finish Vote A and Vote I by Thursday evening.

*MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I wish to refer to that part of the Army which is drawn from the far North of Scotland, viz., counties north of Inverness-shire, and to the want of barrack accommodation in these counties. For years northern recruits for the Army or Militia have had to travel to Fort George, near Inverness, for their annual training. There ought to be accommodation nearer at hand than Fort George. True, there is some accommodation at Dingwall, but only sufficient for a portion of the staff of the 3rd Battalion of the Seaforth Highlanders and Ross-shire Militia, the remainder of the staff and all men of that regiment having to go to Fort George. This is an absurd arrangement, and in keeping with the War Office mode of conducting business.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is departing from the practice of the House in discussing on the general Question small details of that kind.

*MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, what I want to call special attention to is the lack of barrack accommodation in the northern Highlands. I urge upon the Secretary for War the importance of seeing that recruits are properly housed. At Fort George the accommodation in the casemates is not fit for pigs. If it were improved there would be far less difficulty, and less expense, in securing men to enter both the Army and Militia. It is not necessary to refer to the bravery of the Highlanders, who have won fame on every battlefield, but I contend the satisfactory housing of these men ought to be considered. Not long ago the commander of a Highland regiment deplored, at a public dinner in Inverness, the fact that so few Highlanders joined his regiment, and that recruiting sergeants had too often to go to the slums of Glasgow for recruits. I want to see Highlanders in the Highland regiments, and the characteristic dress maintained. Not long since the War Office proposed to abolish the kilt, and put the Highland soldier into tight-fitting trousers, stock collars, and German caps. I wish the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War would look into the arrangements made for the housing of Highland regiments at Fort George. Instead of cruising to Malta and receiving salutes, let him go to the North of Scotland and see for himself what is needed to encourage recruiting in districts where the best material in the world is available.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs): I will not detain the House more than a few minutes. I rise merely for the purpose of joining in the protest of the hon. Member for Islington against the extravagance of these Army Estimates. It is impossible to enter into a discussion of the details now, but I would point out that these Estimates now amount to £34,500,000 whereas four years ago they only amounted to £20,000,000. I am perfectly well aware that, in the Paper he has laid before us, the Secretary for War, in a kind of phrase not unfamiliar in other concerns, tries to make out that the Estimate is not really £34,500,000, although the taxpayers will have to pay that sum.

MR. BRODRICK was understood to refer the right hon. and learned Gentleman to last year's Estimates.

SIR ROBERT REID: I am not speaking of last year's Estimates, and for this reason, that there was a war going on in that year and this year there is not. The right hon. Gentleman should have patience when any criticism is offered. Criticism of these Estimates is required, and I hope will be repeated for what it is worth, both in this House and in the country. The question I am dealing with is that this year the Estimates amount to £34,500,000, and that they only amounted to £20,000,000 four years ago. There is a distinction drawn in this Paper between normal and abnormal expenditure, but there is no year in which there are not abnormal items of expenditure, and the result is that this method of calculation does not mitigate a very serious evil.

The country cannot stand this enormous expenditure on the Army as well as on the Navy; and, for my part, I will take every opportunity of expressing my dissent. The Prime Minister said with perfect truth that the people who approved of and clamoured for Imperialism five or six years ago ought not now to take exception to the Estimates. I entirely agree. But those of us who have opposed the spirit of extravagance, militarism and aggressiveness that has characterised the policy of this country for many years, are entitled to protest, and will protest, against it.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): May I say a word or two in order to prevent the possibility of future misunderstanding? The Prime Minister said something about the necessity of obtaining Vote A and Vote I on Thursday night. We shall see. I wish to say that, so far as the ordinary mind can form an estimate, it does not seem at all likely that that can be done without such a curtailment of the facilities of debate as would not be in the interests of the House or of the country. I think it only right to say these few words lest we should be held as assenting provisionally to the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman.

Question put, and agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1903-4.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a number of Land Forces, not exceeding 235,761, all ranks, be maintained for the Service of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland at Home and Abroad, excluding His Majesty's Indian Possessions, during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): This year has been a great exception to the rule, that the statement with regard to the Army Estimates should occupy the first place in discussions on the Army. During the three weeks of the present session, I, and the Department I represent, have been on trial under many different counts—some of them capital counts—and there were two nights of discussion in this House of which I make no complaint, because, at all events, it differed from the previous discussions, as it went to the root of the matters with which we are engaged, and did not diverge on matters of comparative unimportance. There has also been a discussion in another place; but nothing has occurred in those discussions which need particularly shake the Department over which I preside. We have also had two very interesting sittings, and a considerable portion of a third, taken up with a discussion of the training of the soldier and the officer, and the condition of the auxiliary forces. At least one piece of good fortune results, because, after all this artillery fire, and after we have made such a reply as lies in our power, it will not be necessary for me to carry the Committee over all the ground again. A great many of the subjects which a Minister of War is usually expected to deal with on such an occasion, such as the number of the Army, recruiting, training, and the condition of the auxiliary forces, may all be regarded as, for the present, disposed of, and I could almost wish that we were able to find ourselves for a short time on neutral ground; but after the speeches we have heard this afternoon that would be difficult to assume.

I fully recognise the anxiety professed by hon. Gentlemen opposite, and by some on this side of the House, for economy—though the latter do not enter upon the business with quite so clean a record as the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, because they are unquestionably unwilling now to make good the pledges for which they vehemently asked the Government two years ago, or to vote the supplies and forces which, with practical unanimity, they demanded at the General Election. But I fully recognise that there is a flank attack upon me as well as a frontal attack; and all that I can congratulate myself on is that, almost for the first time in my Parliamentary recollection, the flank attack takes the form of a suggestion for economy by reducing the numbers of the Army. The speeches which we have heard this afternoon have all spoken of economy in the abstract, but they hesitated when it came to the point of suggesting the way in which economy should be effected. As I have often done before, I challenge those who ask for economy to show what they wish to see lopped off. In all the most excellent speeches on the Army which were delivered last night there was not one which did not indicate a large increase of expenditure. The hon. Member for Dumbartonshire drew a halcyon picture in which all the needs of the Volunteers were to be satisfied for a quarter of a million. I made two calculations while the hon. Member was speaking and found that the expenditure would have been, not a quarter of a million but three-quarters before we knew where we were. Now we are going to fight out this question on the point of having what the Government believe to be a sufficient force for foreign expeditions, and also for such home defence as is needed; and I submit that, in framing these Estimates, there is nothing more costly than a partially-trained force of enormous magnitude which still needs a Regular force on which you can place reliance. Of course, if you can achieve the best solution of all—which is to have a force, not necessarily a Regular force, so sufficiently trained that you can place complete reliance on it—then you have only to find the numbers you require, and your best economy is to give your best attention to that force. But in these days every extra man means not only an extra rifle but an enormously increased amount of ammunition, and enormously increased facilities for training and shooting. Therefore, we must not assume that, from the economical standpoint, the one thing we have to do is to get rid of the small and well-trained body of Regulars, and put in their place a great and indefinite number of partially-trained troops. If you do that your last state will be, economically, worse than your first.

I have been challenged more especially on the numbers of the Regular forces for the present year, and I ought to explain exactly how we propose to employ, in case of war, the forces for which we ask money to-day. It has been pointed out that the force on the home establishment has greatly increased since 1897. That is perfectly true. The demands of the Empire have greatly increased in the last fifteen years. The Indian Army, which has to be maintained from home, has been increased by 10,000 men. The forces in the colonies, without South Africa, have been very largely increased; and those forces are not in the self-governing colonies alone. There is the increased liability which has been placed on the War Office to provide for the defence of the coaling stations, without which defence the whole expenditure on the Navy may be regarded as inadequate and futile. These services alone have absorbed a number of additional men. What is the present position?. I will exclude from consideration the extra troops now kept in South Africa. I put the garrison of South Africa, tentatively, at 15,000 men. I am not now going to enter into the discussion, which possesses so much attraction for some hon. Members on that side of the House and on this, as to whether we ought not to keep a whole Army Corps in South Africa. But, speaking from the point of view of economy, I would remind the Committee that every man you keep in South Africa necessarily costs you more. I am not saying that you treat a regiment in South Africa as being like a regiment in India, which requires a linked battalion at home. That may be so; but I am not, for the purposes of the argument, saying it is so. But every regiment you keep in South Africa requires more in the allowances made to officers; the cost of the food is nearly double, the transport of the troops going to and fro is an enormous cost, and the ultimate result cannot be taken at much less than £20 or £25 per man at the least. That is a most serious burden, and we cannot consider that as against any advantage we may get in training the men.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfar): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether that is the extra annual cost of each man?

MR. BRODRICK: I am speaking of the extra annual cost. I am taking the garrison in South Africa at 15,000. Our total normal colonial garrisons are now 51,000. We have a whole establishment of 207,000 men, excluding coloured or native troops. The Army Reserve is about 60,000, or will be in a few weeks. But I am not going to deal with an Army Reserve of 60,000. I do not want to put before the Committee simply a picture of the present moment. I want to draw the picture as it will be, according to a reasonable expectation under these Estimates, within two to four years. By that time the Army Reserve ought to have grown to 100,000. Therefore, I put as against myself that the troops which I have to dispose of are about 307,000 men.

Of this number, what force will be left at home in case of one of these expeditions of which the First Lord of the Treasury spoke the other night—of a call which may at any moment be made upon us for the defence of our own frontiers and requiring 120,000 men to go abroad? In addition to the expeditionary force of 120,000 men, we have got 51,000 men in colonial garrisons. You have thus taken 171,000 men out of the 307,000. You have to deduct, also, the number of those who, belonging to the Army Reserve—a small percentage, I am glad to say—do not, for one reason or another, come up, and the number of men who, from being sick or on being medically examined for active service are found not efficient for the work. That, on an average, taken carefully in regard to our own Army and in regard to others, may be taken as about 7 per cent. That 7 per cent. absorbs 20,000 or 22,000 more. Then we have garrisons in Great Britain almost entirely manned by Auxiliary forces, but requiring garrison gunners from the Royal Artillery and Submarine Mining Engineers. These amount to 13,000. Then we have also to deduct the permanent staff of the Auxiliary forces and the Regular depôt staffs, which between them make 20,000 men. If you add all these numbers together you find they bring up the total to 226,000 men. You have also to add to that 226,000 the recruits under six months service. Everybody knows that the recruits under six months service cannot be put in the fighting line immediately on the outbreak of war. If our recruiting continues as it did last year, when it was 50,000, that would make 25,000 more. Your position then, is this: you have 307,000 men to dispose of. Two hundred and fifty-one thousand of those are absorbed in sending your expeditionary force abroad, in maintaining your garrisons at home, and in keeping at your depôts recruits under six months service. That leaves 56,000 men. Those 56,000 men enable you to provide the first drafts for the relief of the expeditionary force. In all armies, I believe, the first drafts are taken at 10 per cent. If we are fighting on the Indian frontier, we shall require first drafts of our own force and from the Indian Army, fighting under a climate which is not particularly favourable to warfare and in which we must allow for proper casualties. As a matter of fact, our first drafts, even in South Africa, came fully up to that percentage. You have left then 36,000 men. These 36,000 men make the stiffening of the last three Army Corps, the force for home defence, which, I submit, if you are to have a stiffening of Regular troops at all, is not an excessive number to keep in this country. I know these figures seem large, but they were not sufficiently large in South Africa in an expedition, be it remembered, which was being carried on, not against the boundless resources of some great European Power, but against 70,000 to 80,000 men, without military organisation.

I should like to say one word about this question of stiffening. I do not wish to enter again at length into the controversy which has been carried on for the last day or two in regard to the possibility of organising the Volunteers. Nor will I enter here into what I think must be felt too little has been said of in these discussions—the Militia force. The Militia has done as much for the Regular Army—nay, I would say it has done far more for the Regular Army—during the late campaign than anybody could have expected of them; and we are determined that the old constitutional force shall not be pressed out between the Regulars and the Volunteers. We recognise in it the nucleus of home defence, and the possibility of a more extended training than can be asked of such a force as the Volunteers. It has been said by several speakers in this debate, and said with an air of conviction which carries with it a considerable weight, that if you will only give the Auxiliary forces the opportunity of organising themselves they will actually do better than if they have got Regular forces to rely upon. That is a phrase which produces a cheer, but I think it is a doctrine which is most unsound and most untenable. Look what it amounts to in real English. What are the difficulties of the auxiliary forces? Not that their spirit is not good, not that their courage is not good. But it is that they cannot obtain the technical training necessary to fulfil all the requirements of modern warfare, and that with them you find it difficult, with the great demands we make on our officers, to get a number of officers sufficient properly to control the force.

The officer question is the most serious one with which the Government has to deal at present. Modern warfare has this characteristic, that the dispersal of troops being much greater, the length of line being much longer, and the control of the commanding officer, in consequence, being far less complete, an immense amount more is thrown on the junior officers than ever was thrown on them in times gone by. Then consider what is the condition of our auxiliary forces, when, between them, on an establishment of, I think, 14,000, they are nearly 3,000 short of officers. That is a consideration which the military authorities must reckon with when they are deciding what function they are to assign to them. But then there is another consideration. We believe that the Volunteers will be able to serve heavy artillery with great advantage; but we believe also that it is impossible to ask of them the time for being trained to serve mobile artillery. Several hon. Members said last night, "Tell them, in as many words, that there will be no other artillery, that there will be no Regulars, and they will manage to do it." But it is impossible to ask an employer to release for three or four weeks for many years a young man on whose services he is counting, in order that he may become a Volunteer artilleryman, when, perhaps, the emergency may never take place. It is impossible to ask a clerk in a business to make it part of his bargain with his employer that he should give up this time. What we submit is this, that it is imperative on the War Office to see that the auxiliary forces, when they are paraded for actual service in the field, shall have, especially in regard to the more highly-trained technical arm of artillery, a considerable modicum of Regular artillery to support them on these occasions. And I really think that those who scan the Army Corps tables for the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Army Corps, to which my right hon. friend drew attention in the debate the other night, will see that, so far from discouraging the auxiliary forces, we have given them quite as large a proportionate number of units compared with the Regulars in those Army Corps as with any safety we can be expected to hand over to them, besides leaving to them the whole of the defensive positions and an enormous amount of responsibility—in fact, almost the whole responsibility—in garrisoning those fortresses which protect our dockyards, and without which not only our military forces, but our naval forces could not continue to exist. It is for the reasons I have mentioned that I ask the Committee to vote the number of Regular troops now contained in the Estimates. I will not labour the question of military authority, on which a good deal was adversely said by the hon. Member for Dundee, but I will proceed to deal with the question of whether these Estimates are in any way capable of reduction.

The hon. and learned Member for Dumfries spoke of the Estimates as £34,500,000. I do not think that fairly represents the situation. We have just ended a war. So far from complaining that there are still items in the Estimates which are due to the war, I think he ought to congratulate us on the rapidity of the demobilisation, and on the very small amount of cost, compared to the cost of the war, which has gone over into next year. Two millions are for compensation in South Africa, and £2,000,000 are for the extra garrison and transport which we have not yet been able to bring to an end. I sometimes think, when my hon friends below the Gangway twit me with the fact that everything is not yet shipshape at Aldershot, and so forth, they do not realise that we still have twelve or fifteen ships carrying troops in connection with the adjustment of our colonial garrisons, which have been depleted; taking back units to India which have been lent; transferring drafts home from India which have long been delayed owing to the war; and carrying out, in fact, the general demobilisation which, after nearly 400,000 men have been employed, it is not excessive to ask should be completed within the second year. Where I look for economy is this. We have some £2,000,000 of stores which have been especially put upon the Estimates in pursuance of Sir Francis Mowatt's Committee. These £2,000,000, as well as the £4,000,000 for South Africa and the £500,000 for China and Somaliland, may well be expected to disappear, and should not be treated as normal services. There will be an addition, no doubt, when the new pay of the Army becomes effective next year. [A Ministerial Member: How great ?] I think the amount is £580,000. There is some addition to the loan annuity—that is, the loan for barracks granted by the House. There will also be some addition when the Militia Reserve and the Yeomanry come to completion. But those additions will not equal the amount which comes off, owing to the fact that we no longer have this exceptional amount to spend on stores. What I would urge the Committee to consider, when talking of deductions, is that there is more to be done by way of deduction by policy—I am speaking at this moment not of policy in a political sense, but of policy in a military sense—than by those piecemeal withdrawals of expenditure which we have seen in other days, but which almost invariably end in hurried increase at enormous cost and with inefficient results. This House allowed me to increase the pay of the soldier last year. At the same time we made a great change in the matter of the three years system, which will ultimately produce a Reserve not of 100,000 men, but, as is calculated, of 125,000, 130,000, or even 140,000 men, according to the numbers who may accept the conditions. When the Reserve reaches 100,000, then, in my opinion, whether I am Secretary of State or not, is the time when, without impairing these figures which I have placed before the House, you may safely begin to reduce the number with the Colours, because you will have added to the number with the Reserve. The policy I recommend to the Committee is to have the minimum necessary to maintain the *cadres* in efficiency with the Colours, men costing £50 or £60 apiece, and a maximum with the Reserve, costing only £9 apiece. That policy may be pursued not only with great advantage, but, I believe, with great effect in the reduction of our expenditure

Complaints have been made that in connection with our general expenditure we spend too little on some of the most important items. A great deal has been said in these discussions about the starving of the Intelligence Department I am afraid that an expression I used in speaking a fortnight ago has been misinterpreted in this respect. I said, in answer to some interruption, that I hardly thought the House would expect me to propose an increase to the extent of £500,000 a year, as had been proposed, or to the extent of the German staff. The two were put together. In mentioning £500,000 a year I was not speaking of the cost of the German General Staff, which, I believe, is £112,000 a year, or something of that kind. I was speaking of £500,000 a year which has been suggested in some very able letters, in which it was pointed out, that by that expenditure we really increase our strength more effectively than by increasing the number of battalions. As to the German General Staff, which we are urged to imitate, I cannot go into the whole of the figures now—it would be too lengthy—but the number of officers employed on that staff cannot be compared properly with the number in our Intelligence Department. Their functions are very different from those of our Intelligence Department, and the German Staff combines a number of functions which are discharged in our Army by Intelligence officers attached to the staffs of the generals of districts. Therefore our Headquarters Intelligence Staff must be taken in connection with those who are employed in districts, and it must not be forgotten that this Empire keeps three staffs—the British Intelligence Staff, the Indian Intelligence Staff—military—and the Naval Intelligence Staff. The expenditure on these three staffs taken together must be regarded as the amount which the Empire gives to military intelligence. I can only say this: It is perfectly true that the additional amount put down in the Estimates for Intelligence this year is only a sum of £3,000, but that is by no means the measure of what has been done. I confess to the House that I had not been able to frame the total in connection with the Intelligence Staff before the Estimates, but it was not for want of moving in that direction. As early as August last year I appointed a Committee to report precisely in what direction a permanent increase of that staff should take place. The operations of that Committee have been affected by the great change made, with the hearty assent and desire of no one more than the First Lord of the Admiralty and myself, in the work of the Defence Committee, as to which, until we began the work, it was impossible to judge whether we should require a separate staff and a separate office under the Lord President of the Council's office, or under the Prime Minister's office, or whether we could work with the existing Military and Naval Intelligence Staffs. We have come to the conclusion that the latter is the best and by far the most efficient form in which we can get our work arranged. Whatever increases are necessary to enable this very important work, which now falls upon the Intelligence branch, to be carried out, the Chancellor of the Exchequer is willing to grant; and those additional officers will be appointed within a very short period. I can only say that since I first went to the War Office, in 1886, when I remember in a very humble way assisting to provide the then Director-General of Intelligence with a very considerably increased staff, I have always held that our Intelligence Department requires strengthening, perhaps more than any other department. In saying that I wish, in justice to the members of that department, to add that too much, as I think—though I do not wish to anticipate the Report of the Royal Commission—has been made of our absence of intelligence before the war. I should be very much surprised if, in the Report of the Royal Commission, more is not said of the use made of that intelligence than of the absence of intelligence. That is a military question into which I do not wish to go. The Royal Commission must pronounce upon it. I think it would be very hard on Sir John Ardagh, whose calculations were proved to have been in most respects wonderfully accurate, should he be charged with the whole of the failure of the early part of the campaign.

I have only another remark to make on this subject. I hope the House, which is so ready to urge upon us, and I believe to vote, the increase of the Intelligence Department, will be equally anxious to vote those supplies of men and material which the Intelligence Department will urge the Government to undertake. It is useless for us to have a Defence Committee to make necessary schemes of defence if we are told, when we come to this House and ask for what we require simply in order to make the provision which the brain of the Army, which the best military and naval experts, demand of us for defence, and which this House insists on our undertaking, and would hold us accountable if we did not undertake—if we are then told that we may have the brains and intelligence, but must not expect supplies or men.

Next to military intelligence one of the subjects which has most occupied us has been the State of the War Office itself. Deep as appears to be the prejuduce against the War Office in the minds of some Members, our critics, with a degree of consistency which is as interesting as it is novel, have united to praise the idea that we should have in future not merely one organisation for the Army abroad, but a second organisation in a second War Office for the Army at home. I confess I have quailed, I believe my right hon. friend who has filled the same position has quailed, at the idea that in future we should have not one War Office, but two War Offices. That proposal, which was made last night, and which has been made by an able writer in *The Times*, will, I think, hardly carry the same weight as other suggestions from the same quarter.

We appointed a Committee two years ago, and this Committee took a great amount of trouble and made many recommendations. It is sometimes said the recommendations of a committee bear no fruit; but I think there has been more result from this report than from any other report of a committee I can remember. I have heard it said that none of the recommendations have been carried out, except to put military clerks in the place of civilian clerks in certain departments, and that that resulted in chaos or confusion. We carried out the recommendation in two of the military departments, and in doing so we have carried into effect what has been urged upon us from time to time, that we should not give purely military questions to be dealt with by a civilian staff when we could find military men, especially retired officers, capable of dealing with them; and I believe that the experiment has now got into satisfactory working. We have not, as has been assumed in some quarters, given the *congé* to a large number of civilian clerks, sending them away with large pensions. Simply some have retired, as they would in every other Department, and a few have been moved; but I believe the system is working well. I believe it is a much sounder system that an officer having to go to the War Office with a grievance, and failing to see the head of the Department or the Adjutant General, had better see a reliable and responsible officer than be forced to put his grievance, often of a private nature, before a civilian clerk, however able and however well trained. I do not wish to say a word in disparagement of the work which has been done by the civilians who have manned the Military Department in the past. I believe it has been faithful, conscientious, and successful work, but I do think we ought to have regard in some degree to men who have served the country, who have retired on very moderate half-pay, and who are thoroughly competent to fulfil the same work. As Sir Clinton Dawkins urged, we should abolish minute regulations and elaborate reports. That I may say, as far as I am concerned, I am prepared to do, and I have abolished every minute regulation which I can find soldiers have advised can be abolished.

But Sir Clinton Dawkins says we should increase the financial power of the Secretary of State and of officers commanding. The Secretary of State is now allowed £5,000 for correspondence, and each general officer commanding has been allowed £250 for similar correspondence. We have given the commanding officers larger power at Dublin, Salisbury, and Aldershot, and the work is proceeding smoothly. The Committee urge that we should enlarge the responsibility of general officers commanding, and so relieve the War Office. We have given larger financial powers, and we have given many appointments to the general officers commanding the Army Corps, and we have left to them the alteration of many buildings, and allowed them to settle the re-engagements of soldiers; and we have put into their hands the dealing with the appointments and the promotion of officers in the Auxiliary forces. Scarcely a week passes that we do not transfer some work which has been made the subject of correspondence with the War Office to the general officers commanding the first three Army Corps. Whatever may be said with regard to that organisation as a measure of decentralisation, I believe its fruits have been wonderful considering it has only been established for a year and a-half.

Then we were urged to establish a War Office Board. I have put the War Office Council not exactly on the footing demanded, but on a footing which I believe will be of immense use to our successors. The meetings will be regular, minutes are kept, decisions are recorded—the reasons of those decisions and discussions are also to be on record. Any member of the Council can initiate any subject he thinks necessary, and there will remain what there has never been before in the War Office, on record for our successors without turning over countless piles of papers, a concise, brief, and direct record of all the subjects of importance which had been discussed and which had led to the Estimates of the year. Then, Sir, we were urged to substitute inspection for report. The general officers commanding the Army Corps, and the inspectors of Garrison Artillery, Cavalry, and Yeomanry now carry on the main inspection. I can only say, leaving aside a number of much smaller questions, that I believe the progress of the Dawkins Committee recommendations have been consistent and have been sufficient to enable me to say this—that if it were right to ask a man who has already given so much time to the public service as Sir Clinton Dawkins has done in this matter to look into the matter himself and report whether his own recommendations have been properly carried out, I should not be afraid of laying the document upon the Table of the House of Commons without previously seeing it.

This year has been a most notable one in the organisation of the Army Medical Department. Naturally this House, having discussed the failure of this Department during the war, has now left the subject, but I hope I may be allowed to draw attention to it for a few moments. I believe that this House owes a large measure of gratitude to those eminent civilian surgeons and medical men who have joined, on public grounds, our Advisory Board, and have given us the benefit of their services and advice during the past year. Sir Frederick Treves, Dr. Fripp, Dr. Parry, Mr. Galloway, and Dr. Ball, all of them have given immense time to the public service. We have had to place upon the Advisory Board, who now assist the Director-General, the responsibility of selecting candidates, of examining the condition of our home and foreign hospitals, and of carrying out the great changes which we propose in this Department. Well the first advantage we have got has been that, while previously we could not obtain a sufficient number of candidates to fill the vacancies, at the first examination under the new system I think we had three times as many candidates as we had vacancies, and I am assured that the class of candidate has been of a very high order. Sir, I hope this may continue. We have established a Medical Staff College in London, which will enable our officers returning from foreign service to utilise to the best advantage their leave for study which they have never had hitherto, and without which it is impossible for them to keep up their scientific attainments. Imagine what the position is, or has been, when, after spending many years abroad, a man has only got a few hard-earned months of leave without a centre to which he can go and refresh his knowledge with the numerous developments which take place in modern times in medical science.

Then, Sir, we have done our best to encourage specialisation in the Army Medical Service. Sanitary officers will be employed on sanitation alone. The General Medical Council has made an important change in accepting diplomas of sanitary science and recognising the instruction of the Army Medical Department. A course of lectures on sanitation has been started at Woolwich, Sandhurst, and at the staff colleges in the various districts. We have established in the Army Medical Corps the principle of selection by merit. Names are submitted to the Advisory Board, and for scientific merit promotion is given; and we are endeavouring to bring our medical and surgical equipment up to date. This work will take a long period. You cannot deal with a number of isolated hospitals in a hurry, but I propose, instead of the elaborate machinery by which different branches of the War Office have hitherto dealt with hospitals —one with the building and the other with the equipment—to make a small Committee, either with a civilian member of the Advisory Board or an Army medical member, in order to hand over to them this work in conjunction with the Financial Secretary, and to hand over the whole administration of these services in order to secure continuity and bring the whole question, as far as we can, up to date. I might say also, before I leave the subject, that the Army nursing service, under the immediate presidency of Her Majesty the Queen—who has herself a great practical knowledge of nursing—has been placed on a new footing. The number of nurses has been largely increased, a considerable extra sum is asked for in the Estimate for this service, and, for the first time, a proportion of the most highly paid and highly trained male members of the Army Medical Corps will be trained as male nurses, and will not be put to other Departments. I hope those measures in the case of a further campaign will secure us from what have been spoken of as scandals in the late campaign, and in peace time will conduce to the health and welfare of the soldiers.

There are many other subjects on which no less progress has been made during the year. I should like to say one word on the question of the Remount Department. I have always been one of those who protested from this Table against the undue blame which has been attached to the remount authorities of the War Office, because, when war broke out, they could not adapt suddenly an establishment formed to supply 2,500 horses a year into an establishment capable of sending 250,000 horses in the same year 6,000 miles. I believe that an enormous amount of undue rhetoric has been spent upon the abuse of the authorities on this ground. Of course there have been failures, and I quite admit them. All I can say is that we have done our best under the circumstances. A large amount of this work was done before I came to the War Office, and perhaps the most difficult part of it was done, namely, the immediate and rapid organisation of this Department. At all events the whole question has now been re-considered, and my noble friend the Financial Secretary has drawn out a scheme in conjunction with the military authorities. His proposal is, and we intend to give it a trial, that the office of Inspector-General of Remounts at headquarters, with a small staff of officers, shall be retained as before, but that the Inspector-General of Remounts and the central staff will not, as formerly, undertake to carry on actual purchases. Their whole time is to be devoted to organisation, inspection, and acquiring information. There will be six purchasing agents—in all probability retired officers of experience will be appointed—one in each district and two of them will be in Ireland. These agents will act under instructions from the Inspector-General, who will be directly responsible to the General Officer Commanding. They will not be liable to removal in case of war. Our difficulty in the case of the late war was that the officers on remount duty were in many cases withdrawn and asked to serve with their regiments. These officers will all remain at their post in case of war. They will purchase in their districts the number of horses annually required, and they will make the arrangements for reorganisation and the rapid development of the work of mobilisation. They will, of course, render themselves thoroughly competent in addition. We propose to put four retired officers at the disposal of the Inspector-General for the collection of information and, if necessary, for the purchase of remounts in foreign countries. Other persons will be appointed to discharge similar duties in the colonies. We propose to continue the system of registration, not going beyond 20,000 horses, because we found it worked admirably during the war. I am not sanguine enough to suppose that if a similar great demand came upon us such as we had to meet three years ago some flaws will not be found. All I can say is that we have taken to heart the lessons of the past. We believe that we have put the Department on a sound footing, and certainly we shall not again be caught napping as to intelligence and information as to the sources of supply.

I have had a great deal of pressure brought to bear upon me in course of these debates as to the class of officers who are now introduced into the Army. The hon. Member for Dundee made his annual appeal that the expenses of the officers should be so reduced that young men entering the Army should be able to live on their pay. I quite admit that that is an ideal; I should like to get as near to it as we can; but I believe I am right in saying that even in Continental armies, where there is compulsory service for officers, and where you have got to call men who may have money or not, and the men are bound to enter the profession for a certain period, during which they cannot expect to gain anything except experience of military art—even in Continental armies you cannot expect a man to live on his pay from the moment he enters a regiment. We have taken a very long step forward to reduce the expenditure of cavalry regiments. I believe that the system of not allowing private horses on parade and forbidding any but troop horses on parade, will have the effect of saving in the outfit, which naturally frightens any parent sending his son into a cavalry regiment, of a most serious item of expense amounting to a sum which may be between £200 and £500. Similarly, we relieve the officer of the necessity of buying his field-kit, and of the necessity of buying his furniture when first coming in, paying to him, as in the Navy, a very small annual charge to meet the cost of that accommodation, and incidentally we make our force in time of peace much more mobile, so that they will not carry about that enormous amount of luggage which they have done hitherto. In addition to that, the Commander-in-Chief has put himself in communication with officers of cavalry regiments now in England, and urged on them in the strongest manner the necessity of fixing a limit of expense in their regiments. I will not go further into that than to say that I do not believe that by making any sumptuary law whatever you can reduce the expense in the cavalry regiments; I do not believe you could carry out any such suggestion as the hon. Member for Dundee made, that you should give out an order that no parent should even give his son an allowance on entering the Army. You must carry the spirit of the regiment and the colonels with you. You must get it to be understood in the Army that it will not be tolerated in a particular regiment, that unless a young man can provide a very large sum towards polo or other amusements which are in themselves highly desirable, and which add very considerably to the cavalry officers' efficiency—that unless he can provide a large sum, he should choose some other regiment. I believe that we should obtain assistance from the colonels, and I hope that whether it is *I*, or whoever he may be, the Minister who has to make a statement here in two years time will be able to report considerable progress.

There is also the Question brought before us by the hon. Member opposite, who said that nothing had been said with regard to the improved rifle, and I think one Member also said with regard to the improved field-gun. An improved rifle has been adopted and arrangements made for supplies. I believe the experts, and every expert committee who have recommended the shortening of the rifle, satisfied themselves that there is a gain in weight, and that there is a gain in the handling of the rifle, especially by mounted troops, without any loss of efficiency whatever. If that be so, I can see that an immense advantage has been gained, and I do not think that the House will grudge the money for the conversion. I will not labour the general question of stores and supplies: I can only say that there never was a time when our stores and stocks were so nearly complete as they are at the present moment. We ask the House this year for £2,100,000 under this head. That will, with the exception of about a quarter of a million, discharge and complete the whole sum of nine or ten millions asked for by the Committee that considered this Question. We shall then have at hand and in various districts supplies which make up the deficiencies to which attention was called three years ago, and all I can say is this—that I hope that, having built up these supplies, I shall never live to sit on that side of the House and hear a Minister from this box congratulate himself that he is able to largely reduce the normal vote for the supplies of the Army when it will be perfectly obvious that he is only able to do so—I mean the annual expenditure—by eating up some of those reserves we have conscientiously built up.

I am not going to trouble the Committee with further observations on that point. I fear that the opportunities which will be afforded to me of further explaining the policy of the Government may be more numerous than I myself desire. Although these attacks are the subject of regret to me, they are not in the slightest degree the subject either of surprise or embarrassment—certainly not of surprise, because long before the war was terminated it must have been obvious to many of us that so strong a tide had set in the direction of efficiency, we should soon have that serious set-back which has followed every war in which we have been engaged, and in which a demand has been made for a reduction of expenditure at all costs. I will only remind the Committee before I sit down of what is in the memory of a large number of Members sitting here, that after the Egyptian War in 1885, with the employment of a much smaller force—not one man in ten of those we had to employ in South Africa—our deficiencies were found to be far greater, and the outcry for large supplies was naturally far louder even after the war. So loud was the demand, and so vigorous was the attack, for economy and reduction of the Estimates that the two particular points on which a reduction was made were the Medical Department and the Field and Horse Artillery, about which I have only to remark that when this war broke out these, above all others, were the departments which every Member on both sides of the House fixed as being the most deficient and the most necessary to be strengthened. I mention these points because I remember well that in the debates in this House, and in the discussions upstairs, a vehement appeal was made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton, and I remember also the strong language used by the noble Lord, Lord Randolph Churchill. I remember that the universal idea was that you could get any number of doctors when you wanted them, that the whole city teemed with doctors. I remember also that some fifty to a hundred of the Medical Department were got rid of. My right hon. friend had to stand personally in the breach and assure the Committee of the intention of the Government three years ago to have these deficiencies put right. I hope that history on this occasion will not repeat itself. I do not urge extravagance in our expenditure, but what I do urge is this: Let us be allowed to show you our policy, as we endeavour to do, and let the House of Commons decide whether the policy and the principles which all experts press upon us and declare to be necessary, and which the Government puts its own seal upon—let the House decide whether it will decline those principles and refuse supplies. Whatever course we adopt I hope it will be a course adopted on the principle of what we propose to do, and what we have to meet. Don't let us have a repetition of this futile, this extravagant, policy of sudden cutting down, and then, when emergency arises, having these proposals for increased expenditure. By that system you not only do not get security, but you do not get economy, and I think it would be lamentable, after the experience of the last three years, that this House of Commons, representing after all the richest nation in the world, should be willing to settle down deliberately and of set purpose to an inefficient system of national defence.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): There is necessarily a certain amount of confusion in this prolonged debate, not only because, as the right hon. Gentleman said, we have had a discussion during the last two or three days on many most important topics which will naturally have to be dealt with under ordinary circumstances at this stage of the proceedings, but also because we have the consciousness of a Motion, of which notice has been given, which will raise a great number of the points with which the right hon. Gentleman has dealt. I have been somewhat at a loss to know whether we ought not to get at once to that Motion by way of clearing the air. The two things so run into each other that, if I mistake not, the right hon. Gentleman has delivered in his peroration a part of his statement which more properly belongs to the particular Motion to which I have referred. I shall not dwell at any great length on that prospective Motion, but one must say something on the subject with which it deals. The right hon. Gentleman took a very ordinary course in saying—

> "You who clamour for economy should come here and put your finger upon the item which can be dispensed with. It is for you who talk in this vague way of bloated Estimates, and of the necessity for reduction, to say in what way that reduction should take place."

I take issue with the right hon. Gentleman altogether. The only way that I know in which the House of Commons can promote a reduction, and can insist upon economy, is by saying that a large sum shall be reduced, leaving it to the Minister, with his professional advisers, to say how that reduction shall take place. We have seen it on previous occasions. Lord Randolph Churchill, who is represented in this House nowadays in a way so agreeable to us all, ended his official career by a demand of that kind. Speaking as Chancellor of the Exchequer he said to the head of the spending department, "You must make a reduction of a certain sum." I believe he was met by the same demand, "Pray tell me where you find the item which can be dispensed with." But he stood to his guns and said, "No; that is for you to say. All I can say is that, being responsible for the finances of the country, I cannot afford to give you a larger sum than this reduced amount." That is precisely the stand the House of Commons is justified in taking on such an occasion as this.

The right hon. Gentleman has a knowledge which we do not possess; at all events he can use certain apparent knowledge, without our having the power to probe or examine it too closely, for the purpose of puzzling us the moment we attempt to fix upon any item. But it is exactly the same in civil and domestic life. If any hon. Member finds that his butcher's bill at the end of the week is reaching a sum that he thinks exorbitant he will never make anything of it if he goes and complains of the particular price of mutton, or overcharge in the weight of particular items. There will always be a smooth and pleasant, and more or less convincing, answer. But if he says, "With the same family requirements going on my weekly bill has been so much, and if you do not reduce it to that figure again I will remove my custom to some one else," that is the true way of getting at the heart of the tradesman. That is the true way of getting at economy.

Mr. BRODRICK: Might not the tradesman ask him to have less people in his house?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I assumed the same requirements. Therefore the right hon. Gentleman must accept the fact that the House of Commons is, I think, entitled to say, "These Estimates are higher than we think the financial position of the country justifies, and, therefore, they must be reduced." But the right hon. Gentleman hit the mark when he used the word "policy." The whole of this question depends upon policy. When the right hon. Gentleman went over the number of men that we maintain in this country he showed how many would be unfit in case of mobilisation, how many would be required for garrisons, how many for the permanent staff of the Auxiliary forces and so forth, and then he led up to what he evidently considered an unsafe margin—the number of men who would remain available when 120,000 men had left the country. But that begs the whole question, because are we sure that 120,000 men are required? I take the question of India and of the Indian Frontier, which the Prime Minister the other night, and the right hon. gentleman to-night, brought forward as, after all, the main reason for the recent additions to our forces. What reason have we uninstructed members of Parliament—merely exercising our discretion from the information that comes to us,—what reason have we to believe that 120,000 men will be required on the frontier of India? But the point is more direct than that. What reason is there now for that which did not exist five years ago? Why has the Regular Army been increased to such a large extent within the last three or four years? What is there in the Indian circumstances which justifies that increase? That is the point which must be made clear before we settle the argument of the right hon. Gentleman.

I have said more than once since this session began, that the first thing we ought to know is the actual requirement of the country, and the requirement of the Empire for defence. But those requirements will depend upon the policy you pursue; and I am one of those who think that the real and only patriotic policy for this country is one which would probably put an end to the necessity for this large accession of force for any purpose that can come within our expectation, and the circumstances we see around us. There has certainly been nothing in the South African War which has altered the state of things since four or five years ago; and therefore I cannot but think that the right hon. Gentleman has started on false premises altogether, when he assumes as the basis of his argument that we must be ready at any time to send 120,000 men out of the country as an expeditionary force. The right hon. Gentleman said a good deal of the Intelligence Department, and I think what he said was perfectly reasonable. The Intelligence Department ought to be fully staffed and fully equipped. But, as he said, we have the Indian Intelligence Department and the Naval Intelligence Department, which are to be considered alongside of ours when we come to any comparison with other nations. Let it be gradually and carefully increased as the circumstances show to be necessary; but we have no recent reason, at any rate, to believe that there has been any lack of intelligence supplied to the War Office. The right hon. Gentleman to-night has made a frank admission, which we have never had before, and which is really of the first importance; because he said that at the outbreak of this war it was not lack of information that they suffered from, but that the information they possessed was not made proper use of. That is precisely what we have not only suspected, but have had reason to believe, and have, therefore, stated publicly during all these years. I think he did no more than what was right in removing from Sir John Ardagh and his colleagues any imputation that might exist in the public mind that they had not fully discharged the duty that they were appointed to perform.

The right hon. Gentleman was also very frank with regard to some recent occurrences. Even the word "failure," and even the word "scandal," slipped out from his mouth. Of course he would not call it "scandal" himself. He spoke in some respects of the failures which have been disclosed, which he admitted, and which he is doing his best to remedy. All I can say is that during the time the occurrences were proceeding we did not hear any admission of failure at all; and I do not altogether blame the right hon. Gentleman, because he was bound at the time to make the best case he could. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of the changes which he has been carrying out in the War Office in substituting military officers for civilians. Well, if that is confined to the military departments, I see no reason why it should not be successfully applied; but I hope the right hon. Gentleman will do nothing which will depart from the old constitutional principle, which comes down to us from Lord Palmerston and the Duke of Wellington and other unimpeachable authorities, that while discipline should be entirely in the hands of the soldiers, the financial control and the general control should be mainly and principally civilian. The right hon. Gentleman also says he has done much to decentralise, and that the Army Corps have been very useful in that respect. I am not going to discuss the Army Corps, because the Government themselves do not appear to be very anxious to pin themselves more than is absolutely necessary to that particular organisation. But what I am rather led to believe has occurred is that there has been great decentralisation as between the War Office and the Army Corps, but that between the Army Corps and the district there is as much circumlocution and as much unnecessary interchange of orders and papers and letters as there was before. Supposing some small work has to be carried out at Dover. The matter goes before the officer commanding the South-Eastern District, but he has to send it to Salisbury to the officer commanding the second Army Corps, and he again communicates with the War Office.

MR. BRODRICK: Three times out of four he has not to communicate with the War Office.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I believe it goes to Salisbury, and there it is dealt with by officers who have not the full experience and authority which those in the War Office possess; so that there is absolutely more of what is commonly called circumlocution under the new scheme than under the old, only it is not between the War Office and the Army Corps, but between the Army Corps and the units and divisions under them.

One other subject I shall refer to, and that is the question of the expenses of officers. The right hon. Gentleman found fault with the hon. Member for Dundee and those who placed this matter on a somewhat extreme basis; but I think that this can be said—while the right hon. Gentleman has done something in respect of the provision of furniture and other methods of that kind tending to diminish expenses, the great evil is in the expensive mode in which the regiments are themselves conducted, in their social expenditure, and in those extravagances or indulgences which to the officer of slender means are a cause of so great expense that he finds that he cannot always stand it. It is there that the evil arises. It is exceedingly difficult to check. I agree with what the right hon. Gentleman has said that orders from headquarters do very little; but that is because the officers themselves who carry out those orders very often do not acquiesce in them; or, at any rate, do not take proper means to enforce them. I have heard of a distinguished general going to inspect a regiment, and of reading the officers, and especially the colonel, a lesson against extravagance. He afterwards went to luncheon, and said that that was what he liked to see in the regimental system, and that the regiment did things in a way that did credit to them. He himself was encouraging the very evil he had previously condemned. I know the difficulty in the matter, but still let public opinion be brought to bear on it, and let the commanding officer of the regiment know what the country requires of him, and that it is just as much a part of his duty to cut down unnecessary expenditure as it is to see after any other part of the efficiency of the regiment. When the shot has been fired, the prospect of which the right hon. Gentleman says he contemplates without embarrassment or fear, and I can well believe it, we shall have more to say on the question of the number of men, and the cost of the Army; but for the present there is nothing more which occurs to me now.

Mr. GUEST (Plymouth) said he claimed the indulgence of the Committee in firing the shot to which the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition and his right hon. friend had referred. He could assure the Committee that nothing but a very deep conviction as to the ruinous military policy of the Government would have induced him, a supporter of the Government, to take the step he was now about to take. The speech of his right hon. friend was very interesting and very comprehensive. His right hon. friend was able to show that during his time at the War Office he had been able to introduce many minor improvements into the Department over which he presided. But he thought his right hon. friend would forgive him if he did not follow him into the details of the extenuating circumstances of which he made so much, and if he addressed himself more particularly to the main issue which underlay the whole administration of the War Office, and the military establishment of this country. There was one thing to which he must take exception in the speech of his right hon. friend. His right hon. friend taunted those who now differed from his policy as having pledged themselves to support that policy. But he would point out to his right hon. friend that he could acquit himself of any inconsistency in the matter, as he had abstained from voting for his right hon. friend's scheme when he introduced it. With regard to other friends of his, and to his own action two years ago, the war in South Africa was then proceeding, and it was on that ground, and that ground only, that they did not feel themselves justified in withholding the supplies of men his right hon. friend asked for in the interests of peace; he would point out that that was one of the principal reasons by which his right hon. friend had been able to justify his policy to the House.

He listened with great attention to his right hon. friend's speech, and picked up with avidity the crumbs of comfort that fell from his lips. He was delighted to find that his right hon. friend, like Saul, was also among the prophets, and that, forsooth, his right hon. friend was also one who desired the reduction of the Regular forces of the Crown. That was comforting, but the consolation was to be somewhat deferred, because his right hon. friend told the Committee that the reduction could not take place until the Reserve had been brought up again, not only to what it had been, but even to a greater number. They were all aware that the Reserve was capable of very rapid growth. They knew that not more than a fortnight ago it stood at 32,000 men, that in the Estimates issued only three days ago it had reached 54,000, and that that afternoon it had risen to 60,000. That was very remarkable, but he thought his right hon. friend would not accuse them of undue pessimism if they thought that such mushroom growth was not likely to be maintained, and that it might be years before they saw the reduction to which his right hon. friend looked forward with so much satisfaction and pleasure. What was the meaning of the reduction which he now intended to move? He had put down the figure at 27,000 men, but he would not have the Committee suppose that that 27,000 represented the whole of the economy which he and his friends desired to see effected; nor did it represent any part of the details which they proposed to offer to the Committee as an alternative policy to that of the Secretary of State for War. There was this, at any rate, about the figure. In the first place, it was a substantial figure, and it indicated quite plainly that they desired to see a substantial reduction. In the second place, the figure of 27,000 men, or to be exactly accurate, 27,907 men, represented the increase in the infantry of the Line which had been effected since 1897. He thought there was considerable advantage in dealing with infantry of the Line only, because they escaped the complications which would arise if they included the artillery and cavalry. The proposition he put forward was perfectly simple. He suggested that they should reduce the infantry of the Line to the figure at which it stood in 1897. What were the facts as to the increase in the infantry? Since Lord Lansdowne was at the War Office, and subsequently his right hon. friend, no less than fifteen infantry battalions had been added to the military establishment. There had been a gross increase of 54,000 men, of whom 27,000 were infantry. That was a very large increase.

When his right hon. friend said that they were an Imperial people possessing a great Empire, he failed to see that his right hon. friend demonstrated that the British Empire did not exist previous to 1897, or that at that time it was not adequately protected and guarded, although it did not have the advantage of his right hon. friend's fostering care. What were the reasons on which they asked for this reduction of men? The first reason was that of economy. The Chancellor of the Exchequer would probably share that desire, and he had no doubt that the Chancellor of the Exchequer found himself in a somewhat difficult and uncongenial position with regard to his colleagues when he put forward the very unpleasant and unpopular question of economy; it was probably to private Members that the Chancellor of the Exchequer looked with any degree of hope, for support in effecting that retrenchment and economy which, doubtless, he had at heart. Whatever might be the qualifications of the House to discuss Army matters, he submitted, with great respect, that it was not only the right, but the duty of the Committee, as the guardians of the public purse, to examine minutely into the Army Estimates. When hon. Members who were economists talked on the Budget on economy, they were always taunted with the reply that if they desired economy they should indicate on the Estimates how it was to be effected. He submitted that, at any rate, his Motion was a clear and definite proposal as to how economy might be effected.

He should not be in order if he drew attention to the condition of the national finances. Hon. Members were doubtless well aware of the position in which the country stood as compared with the position in which it stood a few years ago. It was a matter of common knowledge that the normal expenditure of the country had risen by 40 per cent.; that, in fact, they had been progressing at the rate of £7,000,000 additional normal expenditure every year, and he did not think that there was any prospect that that additional normal expenditure would be reduced during the present year. There was another very remarkable fact, and that was that of the £32,000,000 which was imposed under the guise of war taxation, and which was passed by this House because it was war taxation—he referred to the coal tax, the sugar tax, the corn tax, and the income tax—no less than £17,000,000 or £18,000,000 had been absorbed in the ordinary normal expenditure of the country. That great growth, he would not call it extravagance, in the normal expenditure of the country, had been very greatly facilitated owing to the existence of the South African War; but what was the item which figured most largely in that alarming growth? The most noticeable and striking increase of all the items was that for the Army. The Army represented a growth of no less than £10,000,000 during the last four years. The Army Estimates had risen from £20,000,000 to £30,000,000. He was aware that his right hon. friend challenged the latter figure, and thought that the normal military expenditure should be put at £27,000,000, and he stated that that sum was to be accounted for by the retention of a force in South Africa, and the additional cost it involved. But when did he hope to reduce to any great extent the military establishment in South Africa? He himself hardly thought that the reduction was likely to appear in next year's Estimates. Then, as his right hon. friend said, abnormal charges had been incurred, as, for instance, the pay of the Army, which his right hon. friend estimated at £580,000 a year. He would not say that would be the whole of the increase of the Estimates. There would be the increase under that head, and there would also be an increase under the head of Reserves, and in the non-effective services; and there would also be the question of the new rifle, which would come into the Estimates either next year or the year after. Therefore he maintained that the original Estimate for this Army scheme of six Army Corps largely under-estimated the cost.

Under these circumstances, and in view of the great increase of our military expenditure, it was the duty of the Secretary of State for War to explain the absolute necessity of every penny of the expenditure which he proposed. The Committee had not been favoured with that accurate, careful, and painstaking statement of detail which he had hoped to have, and he confessed he was much disappointed with the general way in which the right hon. Gentleman had dealt with this subject. They had heard of European entanglements and commitments in three continents before, but he urged the right hon. Gentleman to explain in a much more satisfactory manner why it was that it was now necessary to spend so much more money on the Army than it was before. He did not rely on economy alone to justify the reduction he proposed to move, because the patriotism of this country was so great that any amount would be voted that was asked for if it was thought the expenditure was necessary and was needed. What he complained of was that this scheme sacrificed quality for quantity. The scheme proposed to give a large number of men, but on that account it was not calculated to give a very high standard. One would have thought that all the extra inducements which had been offered during the right hon. Gentleman's tenure of office would have enabled the country to obtain a better class of recruits, and it no doubt would have done so if the demand had not outstripped the supply. These inducements had been offered much more with the view of enabling the right hon. Gentleman to obtain his numerical ideals than any desire to obtain a better class of recruits.

Then with regard to the Reserve. Under the old system we had a very good Reserve, which had been built up without any sacrifice, but now, unless 50 per cent. of our soldiers volunteered for extension of service, it would be absolutely impossible to furnish our Indian and colonial drafts. In the right hon. Gentleman's scheme great reliance was placed on the popularity of the Service, but desertions had now increased, and only 13 per cent. of the infantry of the Line had volunteered for further service this year, so that the whole of the Indian and colonial garrisons were jeopardised. Yet the right hon. Gentleman came down and produced figures, to the amazement of this House, and for the amusement of other countries. Two years ago the right hon. Gentleman told the House of his scheme of Army reform, and the House granted him unexampled facilities for carrying it out; but after two years the inevitable conclusion was driven home to the minds of hon. Members that the right hon. Gentleman had only perpetuated the old bad state of affairs in a larger scheme. If the amount of men was modified there was very little doubt but that we should be able to obtain a better class of recruits than we were at present able to secure. He did not suggest that by a mere reduction in numbers it would be possible to get rid of all the inefficients in the ranks at the present time, but we might get rid of the undesirable element which figured so largely in the ranks at this moment. Last year we enlisted 2,000 boys under 17 years of age whose presence was certainly undesirable; we enlisted 8,000 under the standard, and our standard was not too strict nor in any way inelastic; we also enlisted 1,000 recruits who were unable to write, and of whom 550 were also unable to read, and it seemed to him, at a time when the individual intelligence of the private soldier was being so much praised, it was eminently undesirable to admit this illiterate class into the ranks. We had discharged 2,254 invalids with under two years service, and increased desertion amounted to 1,500 men. All these men ought not to have been recruited at all, and would not have been if it had not been for the extravagant demand made by the right hon. Gentleman

But over and above these there were a certain number of men who appeared on the establishment who had not been recruited at all, who were non-existent. For years the infantry of the line had been under strength. When they added the number of non-existent, 17,000 out of 20,000 were accounted for in this way alone, so that the reduction he was moving was not so large as it would at first appear, and the reduction of the fighting strength of the Army necessitated by his motion was not so serious as one would have imagined. But let it not be supposed these 17,000 were all that we lost under the present system. At a rough calculation a soldier cost £60 a year, so the sum of money lost would be something between £1,000,000 and £2,000,000 per annum. Under these circumstances the Committee was justified in saying, that so far from having got the form of the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman they had only got the inflation. The very regrettable conclusion was forced upon the Committee that not only would the right hon. Gentleman be unable to raise the standard of the Army, but that the standard was lower than it was when he came into office. Supposing that a small Army was, for the sake of argument, admitted to be necessary on the ground of efficiency, it would be said that there were two objections to it; that in the first place it could only be attained by diminishing the battalions of the Line, and if we diminished the linked battalion system what would become of our colonial and Indian drafts? The linked battalion system was not the only method of supplying drafts. Previous to the time of Mr. Cardwell these drafts were supplied from depôts. It was Mr. Cardwell who threw upon those battalions which happened to be at home the duty of supplying drafts to the battalions abroad, and thus did away with the depôts; but that had proved to be an extravagant method, and he (the hon. Member) believed that the old depôt system was a much better and cheaper method. If, in conformity with settled policy, the Government determined to reduce the number of battalions on the home establishment, it was quite obvious that a resort to the depôt system would be much cheaper, and perhaps better. What was to prevent the Government going in for a mixed system of depôts and battalions? As a matter of fact, for many years past the linked battalion system had been in a parlous state; and in recent years he believed there had been no instance of the equality between the home and the foreign battalions having been maintained. Not only that, but the depôt system, which was supposed to have been got rid of, had reappeared; so that the advantage of the economy which resulted from the linked battalion system had disappeared.

Another practical objection that might be urged against a smaller Army was that, as there must always be a certain number of young soldiers in the Army the mere existence of those young soldiers would necessitate a large force being kept in England. The argument was that we were supposed to enlist men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five, but that, as a matter-of-fact, we had to get them young, with the result that the average age was eighteen. Suppose 50,000 recruits were raised in the year—though he believed that number was larger than necessary—they had to be kept in this country for two years before they could be sent abroad. But that did not account for the 155,000 at present in the Army. Then in the time of Mr. Cardwell foreign service was almost entirely in the tropics, and the objection of sending young soldiers to the tropics played a very large part in the justification of a linked battalion scheme. Circumstances had since changed, and we were now obliged to keep a large number of men in foreign stations of which the climatic conditions were most excellent. For many years to come it would be necessary to maintain from 20,000 to 30,000 men in South Africa. Had the Secretary of State, in his calculations, considered the climatic conditions of South Africa? If not, seeing that he must keep an army there, had he not better make a virtue of necessity and embody that factor in his calculations? His contention was that the balance between the home and the foreign battalions depended on conditions which had long since ceased to prevail. In former days the Army abroad was no larger than the Army it was desired to keep at home; there were no foreign stations of any magnitude with a temperate climate; the Volunteers might be said to have been undiscovered—at any rate, they could not have been looked to to discharge any of the functions of home defence; and the War Office had not encountered the recruiting difficulties with which they were now confronted. Under these circumstances, could the Secretary of State demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Committee that no conceivable proportion other than that of an absolute equality would satisfy the needs of the Empire, or be consistent with the duties it was necessary for us to discharge?

He was aware that it was one thing to demonstrate the economy of a smaller army and to prove that the Army would be better if it were smaller, but that it was another thing to demonstrate its feasibility, and quite a different matter to prove that a smaller army was desirable on strategic considerations. He would at once put aside the question of home defence, because there was a general consensus of opinion, which could hardly be overlooked, that the defence of this country might be largely, if not entirely, entrusted to the citizen army, and the Secretary of State himself, whatever he might say, really concurred in that view, because the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Army Corps, to which the defence of the country was to be entrusted, would be mainly, if not wholly, composed of auxiliary troops. That being so, the question was—Would a smaller army be large enough as the striking force of the Empire? The Prime Minister thought it would not, and, with the Secretary of State for War, had stated that 120,000 men was the irreducible minimum below which it would not be safe to go. If the Prime Minister had arrived at the figure of 120,000 entirely *à priori*, and without any bias of any kind, it was a curious coincidence that the number of men which the Prime Minister thought absolutely necessary for the defence of India should be exactly the number required for the linked battalion system. One was almost inevitably driven to believe that a great deal of administrative confusion existed in the strategic ideas governing the number of men kept in this country. The "linked battalion" bias played a much larger part in determining that number than strategists were probably aware. If India was the justification for the large army kept in this country, it was a remarkable fact that India was not mentioned on the introduction of the scheme. It would seem as though the defence of India had come as an after-thought to justify a policy to which the House were already committed. But if there was anything in the argument of the defence of India, it would surely be an argument for keeping a large army, not in this country, but in India, or, at any rate, at some point near India. The defence of India obviously meant not the possession of a large force in this country about whose getting to India there was the slightest doubt, but the keeping of such a force as could with absolute certainty be transported to the theatre of war in case of emergency.

He would not pursue that argument further, but would say a word as to what would happen if the reduction were carried, as he hoped it would be. There was no suggestion that the Secretary of State should at once cashier and dismiss 27,000 men, and cause them to join the ranks of the unemployed who paraded Bond Street and other London thoroughfares. Nothing would happen but a gradual and automatic reduction of the Army. By the selection and rejection of recruits, and the raising of a smaller number every year, the Army would gradually be brought to the figure suggested.

He had tried to show that a smaller army would be to the interest of the taxpayers and of the Army itself, because a better class of recruits would be obtained; he had tried to show that there was nothing sacrosanct in the linked battalion system, and that other methods might be devised by which the necessary drafts and other Imperial responsibilities could be met; and he had tried to show that the vicious linked battalion idea had played too large a part in determining what force should be kept in this country, when that determination ought to have been guided by purely strategic considerations. The Vote under discussion authorised the material out of which the whole Army was to be formed. That army was produced to allay popular apprehension during the late war, and was not the result of a well-balanced and well considered appreciations of the normal needs and responsibilities of the country. There was nothing in it to indicate that a well-defined objective had dictated either its size or its quality. No doubt it produced an imposing array, but one which on closer inspection was seen to lack most of the essentials of a formidable weapon. Lastly, its disposition was such that in time of war this military colossus, instead of protecting the Empire from all mankind, would be found reposing in ignominious impotence upon our southern coasts, unfitted for home defence, unsuited for a foreign country, and probably unable to risk the perils of the passage. That being so, this great home army, instead of being a guarantee of our wealth and possessions, would prove only a heavy burden on the national resources. For these reasons he begged to move the Amendment standing in his name

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a number of Land Forces, not exceeding 208,751, be maintained for the said Service."—(*Mr. Guest.*)

Debate arising.

*MAJOR EVANS-GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) regretted to find himself in agreement with the mover of this reduction. He regretted it because he was not one of those who took pleasure in attacking their Party; he would far sooner do what he came to the House to do, and support them on all occasions. In one of the first speeches he heard from the First Lord, the right hon. Gentleman said that there was no part so easy for a Member of this House to play as to attack his friends amidst the applause of his opponents. He might have added that to some Members, at all events, there was no part so painful or disagreeable. There were times, however, when that unpleasant position had to be faced, and he believed this to be one of them. From the right hon. Gentleman's speech the other night, he gathered that the Prime Minister believed the attitude of those with whom he was acting on this Army question to be incompatible with their loyalty to the Party. With regard to that, he desired to say that during the five or six years he had been connected with the Party, he had worked as hard for the Unionist cause as any Member on that side of the House. Why had he done this? Because he had believed, and still believed, that in so doing he was, in however humble a way, working for the best interests of the country. But if it should happen —as in his belief it had now happened— that the proposals of the Government were opposed to those interests, he felt bound to do what he could to prevent their adoption. Members had duties to their constituents as well as to their Party. The Prime Minister seemed to think that they were actuated by a desire to trim their sails to suit the changing gales of popular favour. He represented one of the poorest constituencies in London. To them the smallest increase of taxation meant a real and heavy burden. They never wavered or murmured during the war, and he felt sure, if it could be shown that they were getting their money's worth, they would not waver now. But could any hon. Member of that House go to his constituents and conscientiously say that he believed the country to be really getting in the Army an adequate return for the gigantic sums demanded for it? If so, he was more fortunate than himself, for he confessed that he could not.

That question of the strength of the Regular Army to be maintained in England might be divided under two main headings:—Firstly, What were their Imperial requirements? and secondly, Were those requirements being met in the most economical way, and to the best strategical advantage? With regard to the former there was little that a private Member could say. The Prime Minister, speaking with all the great authority of his position, was unassailable. He was in possession of information which they could not possess, and which even if they possessed it would be highly undesirable to discuss. By the light of that knowledge he told them that such and such a force was necessary; and they could not complain if he withheld the reasons which had led him to this conclusion. When, however, he came to the nature of this force, the best and most economical way of providing it, and the most advantageous positions in which to place it when provided, they were on different ground. These matters might be discussed and argued without fear of injury to their most delicate diplomatic relations.

Into the economic side of the question he would not enter further than to say it was rather to the development of the latent voluntary resources of this Empire that their efforts should be directed, the resources which, after all, alone enabled them to wage and to win the South African War, and upon which, Army Corps or no Army Corps, they would in any great emergency ultimately have to depend. The Estimates now before the House were merely the commencement of a vast expenditure, which, in his opinion, would represent but an insignificant increase in their real military strength. He suspected the scheme, and he suspected the Department which had the administration of it. Reform in the War Office itself should have been the first step. The light would not shine if the generating station was out of gear. No scheme, however well devised, could ever hope to be successful so long as the administration of it was in the hands of a Department in such a condition as was disclosed by the Clinton Dawkins Committee.

Was there any ground for supposing that the War Office had been reformed, or that the Committee's recommendations had been adopted? He asked last year and got no reply of any kind. The things they did know did not inspire confidence. He did not know whether the House had observed one most remarkable feature, namely, that in the War Office action invariably preceded inquiry. They had the Army Scheme introduced before the War Commission had reported. Reforms were introduced, and the Cabinet Committee was remodelled to endorse those reforms. The Volunteer Scheme was launched, and the inquiry held afterwards; and now a Royal Commission was to be appointed to inquire into the Volunteer question. Was it not lamentable that the War Department of this country was self-confessedly incapable of producing a really matured scheme? Could they be blamed for their want of confidence in its conclusions when they had to be revised and reconsidered in that way as soon as they were formed?

But apart from that, of two things one would happen—either the efficiency of the Army would be sacrificed to the fear of the expense, or the expense would be such as the country would not stand, and could not bear. Closely allied to the question of expenditure was the strategical position of the troops for whom the expense was incurred. Where were the men required? In which portion of the Empire was the struggle to come? The Prime Minister had supplied them with the answer—it was India. A few days ago a startled nation heard for the first time that the military preparations were regulated by the necessities of our Indian Empire, and that the Army Corps in England were the answer to the Russian menace in Afghan Turkestan. Here again one recognised that the Prime Minister was on delicate ground. He might be in possession of information which was unknown to them. There might be new facts which had seriously altered the situation. Nevertheless, it was somewhat remarkable that no hint of them had reached hon. Members until then. The evidence had all been in the contrary direction. Hitherto far from sending reinforcements from this country, India had over and over again come to our aid. At one and the same time she contributed 1,300 British officers and 20,000 native soldiers for China, and 13,000 British officers and men with 9,000 native followers and bearers for South Africa. Thus the country whose military weakness was now stated to be the *causa causans* of the present policy was actually able at a most critical time in her own history to send away 35,000 officers and men for service in other parts of the world. They heard nothing of India's weakness then.

The Prime Minister now told them that the strategical position of Russia was improving from year to year, and from month to month. Quite so—but that was nothing new, and if Russia had been advancing they had not been standing still. He spoke on that subject with much diffidence, because the Prime Minister seemed inclined to cast ridicule on two of his hon. friends who had made some effort to study the Central Asian and Indian problem for themselves. He dared say that he in his turn might be laughed at for his temerity in approaching the subject; but he might inform the House that without pretending to be an expert, he had spent twenty years of his life in India, and three years in the Indian Foreign Office, during which time he had charge of the Frontier branch of that Department. While it was wise and necessary to keep a watchful eye upon Russian preparations, they need not lose sight of what they had done and were doing themselves. Many millions had been spent in improving and strengthening their position. When he thought of what the frontier was twenty years ago, and what it was now, the change was almost miraculous. They were firmly established in Chitral, and had opened the direct route thither from Peshawar instead of having to rely on the enormous detours *viâ* Cashmere and Gilgit. Frontier roads and railways had been everywhere constructed. The Khaiber Kohat, Kurram, Tochi, and Gomal passes had been opened up and were as safe to-day as Piccadilly, and the frontier cantonments had been, and were being, connected with the military resources of India by light railway systems. Southward let them think of the incalculable changes which since the days of Sir Robert Sandaman had taken place. Beluchistan Quetta, then an inaccessible outpost, had become a railway centre, and an impregnable military position. The rails ran on to the Afghan border, the Amram range had been tunnelled, and everything was in readiness to carry on the line at a moment's notice to Kandahar.

From Quetta the branch to Nushki was under construction and would make a very material improvement in their position in Seistan. But the preparation had not stopped there. The Indian Army had been reorganised and re-armed. It was never more loyal, efficient, or animated by a finer spirit than it was that day. The less efficient regiments in Madras and Bombay had been replaced by the finest fighting material in the world, and finally, powerful contingents from the native state armies had been disciplined, armed and drilled, and now formed a further valuable asset in their Indian military balance-sheet. Besides those great developments of their military position, other influences little known or noticed in that country had been at work, which had greatly improved their position. Under Lord Curzon the whole frontier policy had been changed. Better, closer and more direct relations had been established between the border chiefs and independent tribes across the frontier. Regular garrisons locked up in costly fortified positions, which were lost to India's offensive strength, had been replaced by tribal levies and militia, who had thus been given an interest in the defence of their own homes, and were year by year becoming more efficient and loyal. If war were to break out to-morrow the Regular Army would be free for concentration on the new lines of advance. All this had been done, and yet large sums of money had been saved.

In estimating the Indian position, they might fairly look at both sides of the account, and, in his judgment, their own preparation to a very considerable extent balanced the preparations of Russia. He hoped he might not be misunderstood, and that it would not be thought that he sought to minimise the gravity of the Indian situation. He wished to measure its intensity, and to discover whether the best means were being taken to meet a possible, if improbable, danger. To be prepared was to make that probability more remote. The question was, Does this Army scheme prepare? He respectfully submitted that it did not. He went further, and said that the placing of three Army Corps in England, with the avowed object of reinforcing India, when considered by the light of the chance of their being unable to leave these shores, if not an actual danger was an added temptation for an attempt upon India. It might be taken as practically certain that war with Russia would mean war with France. He thought, therefore, that the Committee were entitled to know how the Government proposed, in this eventuality, to dispatch their Army Corps from these Islands. That was surely the crucial point in the whole scheme. It was not sufficient to say that 100,000 troops were required for India, and to suggest no means of getting them there. A hundred thousand men with guns, horses, and supplies would require 150 ships. How was this procession to be protected? It presupposed a command of the sea such as had never been contemplated by the most sanguine optimist. It meant, before a single brigade could leave these shores, an absolute sealing up of two powerful hostile fleets.

In the recent war, the mere unopposed transportation of the Army to South Africa was considered to be a great military feat. How would the longer journey to India, with two naval powers against us, be accomplished? If the safety of India depended upon this uncertain and most precarious aid, her position was anxious indeed. Surely the proper course, the only safe course, was either to strengthen the force in India itself to such a point as would render her independent of help from home, which might never reach her, or to place troops in such positions as would enable them to be sent on without having to run the gauntlet of two hostile fleets. One or both of those alternatives should be adopted. If the former, then the addition of 20,000 Gurkhas, Sikhs, and Pathans on the spot would, in his humble judgment, be worth many Army Corps, and would provide as good a force at a quarter the cost. In any case, it seemed clear that the menaces from the North-West must be met by a corresponding increase of strength on the soil of India itself, a further development, that was to say, of the wise and watchful policy which had been steadily pursued for years. India must take out her own life insurance policy, even if she did not pay the whole premium upon it. If there was danger in the steady approximation of the Indian and Russian frontiers to one another, then do not let them delude themselves, or allow themselves to be deluded, into the belief that they were meeting that danger by creating that costly Army in England. To him it seemed madness to gamble the safety of India upon the chance of their being able to send her timely aid from home. If India was depending on that, she was depending on a slender thread. At best, not a man could start from here for six months; at worst, few would reach their objective at all. The battle of the ironclads must in any case be fought out first. Was it not the Secretary of State for War who said that we could not run an Empire upon an off chance? Yet that seemed to be precisely what they were doing. The troops were wanted for India, but they must run the chance of ever getting them there.

*Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) said he was only interested in the domestic difficulty on the other side of the House in one respect, and that was, that one of the leaders of the revolt was his hon. friend and colleague in the representation of Oldham, and he found it a little difficult to see how, in regard to that matter, the battle was to be set between them at the next General Election. The hon. Members who moved and seconded the reduction of the vote of men had dealt with a great many matters of detail. He would address himself entirely to the wider aspects of the question. He felt that he almost ought to apologise for speaking at all, for he looked at this question from the civilian standpoint. He would confine himself to discussing the broad principle brought before the Committee in the Amendment. They had now no longer to deal with the question whether there were Army Corps or not. There was no need to discuss any more the technicalities of organisation. The question before the Committee was whether the whole scheme was a right scheme. What was the minimum peace establishment of Regulars they ought to have at home; what was the cost of it; could they bear that cost; and if they could bear it, how was the cost to be apportioned as between the Army and Navy? Those were matters on which a civilian might naturally have an opinion. The reduction of the Vote was advocated firstly because the number of Regulars they were to have at home was considered too large, and in the second place because of the economy which would arise from it. The advantages of this reduction were obvious. They were getting to a dangerous point on the Estimates of their national expenditure. Those had gone up £40,000,000 in a few years, and local expenditure had increased £10,000,000. They had therefore an increased expenditure of £50,000,000 to face, which meant that out of every £30, or thereabout, £1 more went in taxation than was the case seven or eight years ago. They had to face at the same time intense commercial competition. England could not live without her commerce, and every increase of taxation added to the difficulty of that competition. He thought that at that time, so long as they had efficiency, their greatest interest was economy in non-productive expenditure. That reduction would have other advantages, particularly in regard to the question of recruiting, which had been so well dealt with by the hon. Members opposite. The advantages were obvious enough, and still he felt it was a serious matter to vote for a reduction like that and say that the establishment recommended by the responsible Government was 27,000 too large.

Military authority rested with the Government. There were some young Service members and some old Service members who in that matter were against the Government. That was not to him a Party matter at all. He was anxious to see some general agreement on both sides of the House. That was a serious matter affecting their national existence, and it was not suitable for discussion at General Elections at all. He would state why he must vote for the Amendment. In the first place, in dealing with that question they were largely in the dark. The Committee knew that soldiers differed on many questions of great importance. His right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition, who was driven out of office on account of the Cordite Vote, always said that he had the authorities with him on that particular matter. He had no doubt the right hon. Gentleman was perfectly right. The ordinary Member of the House of Commons had not access to official documents. What did they know about the three Army Corps? They knew that they were not wanted for home defence or any ordinary expedition. They knew that they were not enough to engage in a great European war. The one contingency for which those three Army Corps were wanted was for the defence of India. He confessed that he looked at the question of India from the standpoint that their greatest danger might arise from Persia in the future. In his speech on the Amendment to the Address moved by the hon. Member for the Whitby Division, and seconded by the hon. Member for Plymouth, the Prime Minister said—

> "I am bound to say that I am not aware of a single military authority who has been responsible for giving an opinion upon this question . . . who takes the sanguine and optimistic view of my two hon. friends."

He warned them that events moved rapidly in Central Asia, and added—

> "The strategic position of Russia has improved year by year—I had almost said month by month—in the character of its communications between those great passes, and the points at which if unhappily—though, I believe, most improbably—hostilities were to break out this force would be required."

That was rather a cryptic saying. The problem was the defence of India, and all depended upon where the force was required—the ground chosen for fighting out that struggle—should it unfortunately occur. The right hon. Gentleman said the problem must be strenuously worked at by the Defence Committee. He took that to mean that the problem had not yet been worked at by the Defence Committee.

At any rate no final judgment had been come to, but the right hon. Gentleman said that—

> "In case of a war with Russia we should require not merely the force which we have in India at this moment, but a force much beyond what we propose to put at the disposal of the Sovereign."

In a recent war, which was not with Russia, they required a great many more soldiers than were being provided by the scheme of the Government, and no man could deny that they would want a much larger force in the event of a war with Russia. But what they were providing now was an Army, not on a war footing, but on a peace footing; and the question was, were 120,000 men required on a peace footing in case they were plunged suddenly into a war with Russia? The question they had to consider was the point of time, for time was the all-important element in regard to a military or a naval war. Russia could not invade India—that was general knowledge—with less than 200,000 troops, and how long would it take Russia to get 200,000 men to the Indian frontier, and how long would it take this country? Whether the war took place in Afghanistan or on the Indian frontier were very different problems. Russia must have railways and stores; she would probably have very severe weather, and, in some seasons, a lack of water; and there would be a great wastage on the way. Above all there would be enormous difficulties with transport when she left her railways. Even then we would have the superiority in defence, which had been remarkably shown as one of the chief lessons of the last war. Our problem, then, narrowed itself down to this: were the 27,000 more Regulars which the right hon. Gentleman recommended should be ready to go to a decisive point, necessary for the safety of this country in a possible war with Russia? All were agreed that if war broke out, more than 27,000 men would be required. Was the extra time required for despatching the 27,000 men, if they had to be sent, of such enormous importance that the Government could positively say that they must have these 27,000 for that purpose, and that purpose alone? That was the question to which an answer was demanded. A comparison between Russia and Germany was not to the point. Of course Germany had considered her condition in regard to a contest with Russia. He was afraid that we had not; at any rate in view of what the right hon. Gentleman had told the Committee, the case had not been fully considered. In the meantime he could not vote blindly for a case on which the Prime Minister himself told the country that a final judgment had by no means been arrived at.

Major Evans-Gordon.

Some of the greatest military authorities of the present day had been recognised as alarmists on this question. In 1898, Lord Roberts initiated a debate in the House of Lords on the Indian frontier question, in which he recommended subduing the Tirah, but remarked that "the expense of that is not my business." The reply of the Government was that the expense was their business, and that they could not listen to any such proposal. In regard to this matter of Russia, they had been told either too much or too little, and he thought that in the state of the information before the Committee they should pause before voting for this enormous number of men. He had only a few words more to say. It seemed to him that this scheme was being rushed. The present high standard of military expenditure was injuring their trade. If there was a real necessity for it, that should be made known; but he, and many others, had no confidence that it was necessary. The Secretary of State for War had been somewhat hardly used, perhaps, by that side of the House, as well as by his own—and he did not want to attack him—but what had been done by the Secretary of State for War in that matter in the past gave the Committee and the country no confidence for the future. In 1901, in the middle of the war, they had had a grand new Army scheme, evidently not thoroughly thought out. Part of that scheme was that the Militia and the Volunteers were to form a part of the three Army Corps. In 1903, a Royal Commission was appointed to discover the nature and the uses of the Militia and the Volunteers, but that did not give any confidence in the position of the Government.

In 1899, war broke out in South Africa, which was said to have been inevitable.

There was a Committee of Defence existing at that time, but it was quite evident that the problems of that war were misunderstood by the Committee of Defence, or whoever was responsible. In 1900, the Committee of Defence was reorganised with the view of dealing with the whole problem of Imperial Defence; but in the meantime it had been proved that two different schemes of defence had been put forward at the Colonial Conference by the Secretary of State for War and the First Lord of the Admiralty, and that there had been serious differences in the manner in which the Army and Navy authorities looked at the question of Imperial Defence. Yet after this new Defence Committee was formed, and before it had had time to go into all those questions, the permanent necessity of having these 27,000 additional Regulars for the defence of the Indian frontier was pressed in Parliament by the Prime Minister, who himself had said that he had not had time to consider the matter fully.

One word in conclusion in regard to the Intelligence Department. The right hon. Gentleman warned the Committee, and he quite appreciated the value of his warning, that if the Intelligence Department were to be reorganised and expanded it was quite possible that the Committee of Defence might be faced by new claims for expenditure, and, if so, they would have to ask the House of Commons to meet those claims. So far as he was concerned he would much rather that these matters were looked after by a qualified Intelligence Department, and he was sure the Committee would have more confidence in the Government if they knew that that was the case. The result might be to increase or diminish the expenditure, but he would rather have it, even if it increased expenditure, because it was one of the great essentials of the present time. They needed an Intelligence Department far more than any other country, and he believed, whether it resulted in an actual saving or not, it would be a relative saving, and would lead to a great increase of efficiency. Whatever was done he hoped that the Intelligence Department would be encouraged and increased rather than diminished. He had spoken a good deal longer than he had intended, but he had tried to make clear his position, so far as his information went, and his vote would go for the Amendment and not against it.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said he felt great diffidence in addressing the Committee on what some might regard as a purely military matter; but he excused himself on the ground that that Vote had become not an Army but a taxpayers' question. The Leader of the Opposition seemed to think that when large Estimates were proposed by the Government it was quite enough for the House of Commons to protest, and that it was no part of their business to show in what way retrenchment was to be made. He could not agree with that proposition. He was only expressing the general feeling of the British public when he said it was confidently hoped that, when the South African War was over, the military and naval expenditure, which had been very cheerfully borne during the war, would be materially reduced. Therefore, it was with considerable shock and surprise that all the people of the country found that the normal military expenditure, which the Government proposed to undertake, was considerably in excess of that found sufficient in 1897. His hon. friends the mover and seconder of the Resolution had put their finger upon a definite proposal for economy, and said that by voting 27,000 fewer men for the professional Army they would be able to economise and reduce this military expenditure Well, now, that was what the Committee wanted to examine. Would it be safe for the country to reduce the professional Army down to the number of which it consisted in 1897? They could ask the Government to show why a greater professional Army was more necessary now than it was in 1897. During the whole of these military debates he had listened to all the speeches made on both sides, because he was anxious to gather, if he could, what it was that the military authorities said they wanted a professional Army for. They wanted it, first of all, to be a nucleus for the defence of the United Kingdom. It was to be supplemented by a citizen Army, into the composition of which he did not intend to enter. Well, for that purpose, what was wanted was not a very numerous Army but a very highly-trained and efficient Army. A great deal of doubt had been expressed, in the course of those debates, as to the efficiency of the professional Army; and every proposal made by way of increasing the efficiency of the officers and men would be accepted by the House of Commons, and all the money necessary for that purpose would be cheerfully voted.

That nucleus of the professional Army must consist of a number of highly trained officers, and non-commissioned officers and men of sufficient experience to organise the force when it was made up of the less highly trained citizen soldiers on whom they might have to depend. The next reason for which a professional Army was necessary was for the defence of India. He was much surprised that the taxpayers of the United Kingdom should be asked to pay anything for the defence of India, because it had always been the policy and practice of the British Government, and he thought that practice was justified, to make India pay entirely for its own defence. So far as the Indian Army was concerned the whole cost was paid by India, who also paid every single penny of the cost of the British troops with which the Indian Army was reinforced. India not only paid the cost of that Army in India, but its transport and other expenses incurred in this country for the purposes of that Army. It also paid its full share for the Navy, which, in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean, contributed to the protection of the Indian Empire. It was the first time they had ever heard of the taxpayer of the United Kingdom being called upon to contribute anything towards the military defence of the Indian Empire. So far from India having hitherto been a burden to the taxpayers of this country they had always benefited the other way. It was a most fortunate thing that they were able to keep a large portion of their troops in India on service entirely at the cost of the taxpayers of India. They had profited on many occasions through having that great military force to draw upon, either for general Imperial purposes or for the purposes of the United Kingdom itself. Their Indian troops contributed very greatly to the strength of their position in the Russo-Turkish War, when they were compelled for diplomatic purposes to intervene; they also had Indian troops in the Abyssinian War, and it was generally considered by military men that Natal was almost saved by Indian troops in the late South African War. In China, in the middle of the South African War, they were able to intervene, so far as their intervention was necessary, with Indian troops, and they had now Indian troops in Somaliland. Under those circumstances it did not seem to him that the British taxpayer ought to be called on to maintain a single man in that country.

With regard to their coaling stations he did not know whether a military force was the most economical force for the garrisoning of their coaling stations and naval bases. He did not know whether it might not be more economical to garrison with marines or some other force less costly than the professional soldier, but that was a small expense, and nobody could object to it. The last reason for which the Committee was asked to keep a large professional Army at home was that they might have a striking force with which they could intervene in any part of the world. If they had to have a striking force at all it was not in the interests of the taxpayers of that country, but in the interests of the Empire as a whole; and at the Colonial Conference they had very clear evidence of what their colonial fellow-subjects thought of the existence of such a force, because they would not contribute a single penny to its maintenance. As a taxpayer he confessed that the policy of maintaining a striking force for the Empire, provided all the Empire contributed towards it, might be justified, but he was not sure that such a striking force was judicious, because if they had a force that could strike they might be tempted to strike when it would have been better if they had not. One hundred and twenty thousand men who could be used anywhere as a striking force might be a great temptation to the Government of even such a peace-loving nation as this, and such a temptation ought not to be put in its way. As a taxpayer he should certainly resist paying any contribution to any such force unless the other members of the Empire, equally interested in maintaining it, paid their share.

Although he had listened to the debate for some days, he utterly failed to see that any adequate reason had been given by the Government, or suggested by any of the supporters of the Government, why the taxpayer of the United Kingdom should now contribute to keep up a larger military force than was necessary for the needs of the Empire in 1897. Their true policy was to have a first-rate Navy, able to protect their shores and commerce, and then to have a small professional Army and a large citizen Army by which this country could be defended; and unless some better reason could be given for the maintenance of that large professional Army, to which the taxpayer of the United Kingdom was called upon to contribute, he should be constrained to give his vote in support of the Motion.

*SIR J. STIRLING-MAXWELL (Glasgow, College), following Sir John Gorst, said he had never intervened in a debate on a military question before, and he hoped he would never have to do so again; but he did not think it would be right for those who thought this Motion extremely foolish and dangerous to remain silent. He represented a large commercial and industrial constituency in a part of the country where the value of money was very well understood; but although he had heard people complain of the taxes he had never heard of anyone complaining of that part of their taxes which went towards the defence of the country. Indeed he had often heard complaints in the opposite direction — that the Army was not strong enough, and that the Navy was not strong enough. The people of Glasgow, at all events, looked upon the Army and Navy as an insurance, and they regarded every penny spent on those forces as wasted unless it were shown that they were able to meet every contingency put upon them. The argument for efficiency was always suspect when accompanied by the argument in favour of economy. When they were told that one of the advantages of reducing the size of the Army was that their constituents would have to pay smaller taxation, that was a very obvious inducement to support what might be a most dangerous proposal. It ought to be the custom of the House to look farther, and not less far, in these matters than those who sent them there. But he would say no more about economy except that if the expenditure was too big they ought to look at every item of their expenditure for a possible chance of reduction before they looked to the Navy and the Army.

If they were to have a proper Army in that country he believed that the only way would be by having first-class men to look after it and to organise it. And first of all they must have a good Secretary of State for War and a good Commander-in-Chief. He would not enter into any criticism of the distinguished gentlemen who occupied those offices; but he thought hon. Members in that House would do better to sit quiet and allow those who occupied those high places to do their best, and if it were found they were not competent men then the House should ask for their dismissal, and have other men put in their places. He did not think they would do more than their best because of the constant invigorating advice given in that House. There had been a very interesting debate on the question of the size of the Army, and he was ready to admit that the arguments might be perfectly valid which had been advanced to prove that they might never have to send an army to the defence of India. If the battle of this Empire had to be fought on the Indian frontier surely it was not reasonable to suppose that India would have to bear the whole expense in connection with it. All he could say was, that a Government which acted on the supposition that because an army was not likely to be needed on the frontier of India therefore they should keep no army here which they could send to India, would be more foolish than he hoped any Government ever would be. He dismissed as comparatively unimportant all these estimates of the needs of this country in India, and indeed elsewhere. He was a very plain person—[Cries of "No, no!" and laughter]—and he could not forget that only four or five years ago they had no idea that they should want a large army in South Africa, although they quite expected that a war might take place there. It seemed to him that the best argument for a large

Army in this country was that they never did know how large an Army they would want. That House had been the scene of many changes, but he was surprised that the walls which still echoed with the cry of "more men," should now resound to the cry of "too many." He hoped the Government would not accept the Motion.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he would ask the Government to consent to the adjournment of the debate, as he could not conclude his remarks before half-past seven.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not anticipate the appeal of the right hon. Baronet. It was, however, desirable that they should finish Vote A and Vote I on Thursday, and that Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday should be devoted to the Navy Estimates. If the Committee did not adopt that course it would be necessary to curtail the debates on the Navy Estimates, which he did not think would be desirable. The time up to the end of the financial year was limited, and he did not propose to ask the House to undertake anything else except financial business; and, therefore, any additional time given to one class of business would be necessarily taken away from another class of business. That was merely a preface to saying that if hon. Gentlemen cut off fragments of the sittings it would be all the more difficult for him to meet the case of hon. Gentlemen who desired to address the House. He appealed to the Committee to help the Government, and to arrange the fixed period at the disposal of the House to best suit the convenience of hon. Members. If, however, the right hon. Baronet pressed his request he would not refuse it.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he would give way to his hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said he thought he would use the fragment of time which remained to some purpose. He had only very few words to say, but he thought it would be admitted that they were pregnant. His right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury did undoubtedly put among the reasons he gave for the present system, including the six Army Corps, the danger of the invasion of India by Russia. He himself did not think that that was a very judicious argument for his right hon. friend to use; but undoubtedly it was an argument that was at the bottom of a great deal of the agitation in the country with reference to military and strategic questions. So far as it went, that argument received a certain amount of additional importance during the last few days. If it were true that Russia had any serious intention of invading India, and of succeeding in that invasion, anything that tended to add to the military and naval strength of Russia would add to the probability of her success. What had occurred? Firstly, the Dardanelles had been opened; and, secondly, His Majesty's Government had refused to purchase two great war vessels which were at present unarmed. It had been rumoured, and he believed with truth, that Russia was about to buy them, that they were to be run unarmed through the Dardanelles, and armed in the Black Sea, thereby putting Russia in possession of two additional naval units there. That would seriously affect the question of the invasion of India. The Committee knew that, as far as Russia was concerned, the material States in an invasion of India would be Persia and Afghanistan; and if his right hon. friend were right in suggesting, as he doubtless did suggest, that there was a serious danger of Russian action on the Indian frontier——

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I never suggested that Russia was contemplating an immediate invasion of India. That is the very last thing I would wish to suggest. What I did suggest to the House was, that as it is notorious that France has to consider how to meet a possible invasion of her territory by Germany, though I believe it is the last thing Germany desires, just as Germany has to consider the invasion of her territory by Russia, though I believe also that the last thing Russia contemplates is to invade Germany, so we, like every other nation, must consider the strategic dangers and possibilities that may arise on the frontier of India.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said he did not wish to put it any higher than that; and he had not the least desire to exaggerate; but that was a contingency that was put forward as one which should influence the House. Since his right hon. friend said that, Russia had secured the opening of the Dardanelles, and had probably purchased two warships which were a great accession of strength in case Russia desired to invade India; and the contingency had accordingly increased in importance and the possibility become greater. But another thing had happened. In reply to the Question put by him to the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs the previous day, the noble Lord informed the House that negotiations were at that moment going on between Russia and this country with a view to an amicable understanding with regard to their interests in Persia and Afghanistan. If this country could come to an amicable arrangement with Russia with reference to Persia and Afghanistan, the whole question of the invasion of India would fall to the ground at once, completely and for ever. The point he wished to put was, would it not greatly aid the Government in the negotiations which were in progress—and in which he for one sincerely rejoiced, because he believed if there was a possibility of coming to an amicable arrangement with Russia it would put an end to the suspicions which were entertained—if the Government were to agree to the diminution of the forces now proposed? It seemed to him that that would be an announcement that the Government were prepared to rely more on the negotiations now in progress and less on the forces which would possibly be necessary in certain emergencies. The reply given yesterday was the first statement the House or the world had of the existence of those most important negotiations. In his opinion, the situation had been entirely changed. He would not discuss the strategic possibilities of the invasion of India. His belief was that it would be almost impossible for Russia to invade India successfully, because Russia could only reach India by railway, whereas England could reach that country by ships. An invasion by Russia was indeed so difficult as to be practically impossible; and even if it were attempted, it could be easily met by the troops at present in India.

It would, however, be very much better to come to the amicable arrangement with Russia which was foreshadowed in the answer of the noble Lord, which he trusted would be realised, than to go on preparing for an armed invasion that might never occur. If that were so, it would undoubtedly be a very strengthening act in the negotiations to somewhat diminish the large forces that had been enrolled mainly with a view to the possibility of the invasion of the frontier of India. He thought that the new fact disclosed yesterday should largely influence the Government in creating a disposition to agree to the diminution of the forces now proposed. That was the only use he desired to make of the fragment of time which remained; but he thought he had introduced considerations that should be present to the Committee.

It being half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

WALES (NATIONAL MUSEUM GRANT).

*MR. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) moved "That in the opinion of this House it is desirable to make provision, similar to that made for Scotland and Ireland, for a national museum in Wales." He said that they viewed this in Wales as a great and important educational question. They were anxious to see the educational institutions in Wales brought to such a state of perfection as not to be behind those of any other country. But notwithstanding the fine development of their system of education in the Principality, there was not a national museum to accommodate treasures of artistic, historical, or archæological interest, and no collections of any objects of art relating to Wales where they might be conveniently placed to afford to the inhabitants facilities for study and research. They believed they ought to have a museum similar to those which existed in almost every country in Europe, where every specimen of animal, fossil and mineral of interest to Wales would be adequately represented. They wanted a museum to form a complete exponent of the natural history of Wales—its application to the art and life of the country. They wished the museum also to be a scientific department supplemented by a technological collection. There was almost a national system of education in Wales, from the elementary schools up to the University colléges, and they needed a coping-stone to the system in the form of technical education, and that could not be obtained without a national museum such as they desired to have. Wales was enormously rich in mineral resources, and they desired to have a collection of metallurgical and mineralogical specimens worthy of the country; they also desired to have a collection of objects of art, a library, and ultimately a national gallery of pictures. It was said that the British Museum contained specimens of Welsh objects, and so it did. But what was the good of a collection of Welsh objects of archæology of interest to Welshmen in the British Museum? In London it was not accessible. They wanted the collection in their own country.

What Wales wanted was a national storehouse for Welsh treasures in Wales. Objects of Welsh art and antiquity were scattered all over the kingdom, many of them for sale, with no authority to purchase them for a central collection such as could be preseved in a national museum. They wanted these art treasures in their own country. Scotland and Ireland had been separately treated in the matter of the museum grants. Wales had received special treatment by both political Parties with regard to matters of secondary and higher education. Why not pursue that policy to its logical sequel, and complete the education edifice with a national museum? The attitude of successive Governments had been most sympathetic in this matter. In 1894 Mr. Acland, the Minister of Education. stated that he had no doubt some place would be found for a central museum, and that he would be glad to apply the same system to Wales as was applied to Scotland and Ireland in Edinburgh and Dublin; in 1895 the right hon. Member for Cambridge University expressed his earnest desire to see a Welsh museum established, and in 1898 the Report of the Select Commtitee of the Science and Art Department stated that a very good case had been made out for extending the grant and the advantages of science and art collections in Wales. In 1898 the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University also said he had no doubt the claim of Wales to a museum grant would receive a most favourable consideration from the Board of Education. The Scotch grant for this purpose was £12,000, whilst that for Ireland amounted to £22,000, but Wales had only had two grants of £26 each, one in 1891 and one in 1896, for the museum at Cardiff. The House was aware that a tax was levied by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1901 on exported coal. That tax amounted to £2,000,000, and of that sum Wales contributed no less than £900,000. Yet all she had had in the way of museum grants was these two sums of £26 each. He was not referring to the distributions of objects of art and models and the like. That was not what they wanted. They wanted a great collection of national treasures, and Wales, he thought, had a claim and a right to the museum grant, which all in Wales desired.

Not only had Governments of both Parties been unanimous on this question, but the Welsh Parties on both sides were also in accord. The location of such a museum was an important question in Wales, and, from a practical point of view, Wales had not been slow to approach it. He personally believed in establishing a capital in Wales, and he would make the capital Cardiff, because of the enormous wealth and power of that town, and because of its being a great industrial and railway centre. But, apart from that, last year all the County, Municipal, and Urban District Councils, as well as the Councils of the three Constituent Colleges of the University of Wales, were invited to adopt a memorial to the Lord President of the Council praying that a grant should be made to Wales in respect of a national museum, and that the location of such a museum should be settled by arbitration, to be instituted by Government in the same manner as the location of two of the Welsh University Colleges. Now ninety-four out of a total of 114 councils adopted the memorial in its entirety. Of eleven councils who have adopted it in part only about six of them urge that, having regard to the geographical and educational condition of Wales, the purposes of a museum grant would best be promoted by a distribution amongst the three University Colleges. Scotland had four universities, yet there was only one national museum, and that was in Edinburgh. In Ireland there were four colleges and one centre for the national museum, which was Dublin. Why, then, should they not have a centre for a really fine museum in Wales? The self help shown by the Welsh people was remarkable. They had never come to this House for an educational grant without having made large contributions themselves. In Carnarvonshire the people had contributed in a very few years £20,000 towards secondary education. That was equivalent to a 7d. rate in the pound, and that was not done by Act of Parliament, but was simply the result of the zeal and zest of the Welsh peasants for education. Bearing in mind the efforts which have recently been made in the cause of Welsh education, a national museum as a great educational agent was essential. So they earnestly asked for a grant to enable the Principality to possess a museum worthy of its people and of their possibilities. He begged to move the Resolution standing in his name.

*MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs), in seconding the Motion, said he hoped it would receive a sympathetic response from the Government. Ever since the late Mr. Thomas Ellis had mooted this question, the greatest interest had been taken in it in Wales. It was in no sense a Party question, because they had received sympathetic assurances from the occupants of the Front Bench of Governments from both sides of the House. It was not necessary for him to argue at length the justice of the claim which Wales made for a due share of the museum grants of the United Kingdom. All Wales asked for was, that, while she had her own system of education, she should in this respect be placed on an equal footing with Scotland and Ireland. It was difficult to say what was the amount of the grants to those, because it was almost impossible to get together under one head the moneys devoted to these particular purposes, but in the United Kingdom, as a whole, £400,000 was devoted to these purposes, and out of that amount Wales had only received two sums of £26 towards an exhibition at Cardiff, and other small doles of a similar character which had been received from time to time. That was not what she required. It was sometimes said that the British Museum ought to satisfy them, but it existed for Scotland and Ireland as much as it existed for Wales, and very little special attention was given to Wales in that respect. To show what little interest the British Museum had taken in matters relating to Wales, he might mention that a catalogue of Welsh books in the Museum Library had been made by a private gentleman and published at the expense of a private society. He did not desire to attack the British Museum in this regard. Its interests were world-wide, and it could not give proper attention to every district, therefore he did not blame the British Museum. He only drew attention to the fact that it was not of any substantial use as a museum for Wales. What Wales wanted was a national storehouse in which the antiquities of her race could be collected together, and which would also contain a national art gallery and national library.

Valuable collections relating to Wales had been scattered to the four winds from time to time; many private collections, which would have been readily given to an institution of this character, had been, owing to the non-existence of such an institution, dispersed, in some cases under the auctioneer's hammer. He urged the right hon. Gentleman to remember that in institutions of this kind there was far more safety from fire than was the case in private collections. Two of the largest and most valuable collections in Wales had been destroyed by fire, and that was the fate which might overtake all the private collections which Wales possessed. Wales was a country of great natural beauty, and many artists had made it their home and had founded an Academy of Art; they had done the best they could with the means at their disposal in times past, and he thought now the time had come when some encouragement should be given to the great work they had taken in hand. There was no country nor any province of any country in Europe, with perhaps the exceptions of Russia and Turkey, which received less help from the State than did Wales in this matter. He knew he need not apply to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Board of Education for sympathy in this matter, because no one knew better than the right hon. Gentleman the high and important part a museum had in the educational system of a country. Some people were still under the impression that a museum was an institution for stuffed whales, bottled crabs, and collections of Maori spears all more or less covered with dust, but that idea was now exploded. A museum was now regarded in its educational aspect, and that was the way in which Wales desired to regard it to-day. Since 1880 she had formed a system of education of her own of which her people were very proud, and all she asked now was that the Government should put the coping-stone on that system by giving Wales a due share of the museum grants of the United Kingdom.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to make provision, similar to that made for Scotland and Ireland, for a National Museum in Wales."—(*Mr. William Jones.*)

MAJOR WYNDHAM-QUIN (Glamorganshire, S.) thought that the House would admit that a very clear case had been made out on behalf of the demand for the establishment of a national museum for Wales. While he thoroughly concurred in the reasons already put forward, he based his claim rather on the broad ground of national expediency. A great deal had been heard of late about education and the necessity for it, and however much they might differ as Parties, they were unanimously agreed that if the Empire was to retain the high position it now occupied among the nations of the world, the highest possible standard of education must be within the reach of all classes of the community. Among the different branches of education, technical education held a high place, and in no way could technical education be better assisted than by the establishment of well-equipped museums throughout the country. Particularly should those parts be helped who were willing to help themselves. In no part of the United Kingdom had more zeal for, or greater devotion to, educational efficiency been shown than in Wales. The love for learning was not a mere modern characteristic of the Welsh people. Some of the oldest educational centres had been within the Principality, and at St. Bride's Major as far back as the eighth century, long before the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were dreamt of, there existed a flourishing and opulent University capable of maintaining and instructing no fewer than 1,000 students.

Whatever might be their views as to the desirability of separate legislation for Wales, they must all remember that a distinct educational system had been accorded to Wales, and by a Unionist Government; that being so, he could not see on what principle of equity or justice the object they were now seeking could be denied, especially as a museum was the natural sequence of that particular educational system. The Welsh people had many interesting characteristics, and were, on the whole, a very intelligent people; they had a record of traditions going back into remote antiquity; they were a far older nation than the English; and they had ever been distinguished, not only for their love of learning but for the sacrifices they were prepared to make to maintain it. Surely, then, they were entitled to the consideration they now sought. The demand had been refused in the past on the ground that they had not been able to settle among themselves where the educational capital was to be. That difficulty had now been removed, and they had agreed to leave the selection to the Government. He earnestly hoped, therefore, the Government would accede to the unanimous request of the Welsh Members.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said this subject had been before the House on many occasions, and in pursuance of time-honoured custom he, as the representative of the Board of Education, rose to express the sympathy of the Department and their inability to carry out the kindly intentions they possessed. In the past the Board of Education and the Welsh Members had really been at cross purposes. Welsh representatives had said that they wanted a museum representing the literature, arts, and manufactures of Wales; while the reply of the Board of Education had been that the museums at Edinburgh and Dublin were outside the purview of the Board, that they had nothing to do with Scotland or Ireland, that they were concerned with Wales only as a part of England and Wales, and that in that respect Wales got its full share of what the Board was able to do towards the establishment of museums over the country. The powers of the Board in this respect were very limited. The great museum with which the Board had to deal was that at South Kensington, which was devoted to the promotion of the study of science and art, and not only had a great collection of the works of science and of the history of science, and of the works of art and of the history of art in all its branches—a collection of great educational value—but was a circulating museum, sending specimens and collections all round the country to local museums for the benefit of students of science and art in the districts concerned. Wales not only had its full share of the circulating element of the museum, but he had a letter from the museum at Cardiff saying that they had not room to receive all that the South Kensington authorities were prepared to send. The Board of Education could also contribute out of a small sum towards the purchase of objects for promoting the study of science and art. The sum was not large, but, such as it was, Wales received its share. That, then, was what the Board of Education could do, but that was not what the Welsh Members asked for, and the objects for which the museums with which the Board of Education had to do existed were not the objects which the Welsh Members had in view in this demand. Towards those objects the Board of Education could supply only what they had abundantly supplied in the past, viz., their sympathy; but the Treasury could do more. What the Financial Secretary to the Treasury would say he could not predict, but he had risen to explain that it was not from want of sympathy—the Board sympathised heartily with the object the Welsh Members had in view—but from want of capacity the Board of Education were unable to meet the requirements of the situation.

SIR ALFRED THOMAS (Glamorganshire E.) said they had again received much sympathy, but they wanted something more substantial. They wanted a little money, and he hoped the Financial Secretary to the Treasury would be able to make such a statement as would send them on their way rejoicing.

*SIR JOSEPH LAWRENCE (Monmouth Boroughs) said he wished, as the only Member present who represented Monmouthshire, which had both racial and historic affinities with Wales, to associate himself most heartily with the supporters of this Motion. There was a peculiar fitness in his supporting the Motion, as he championed the Government over the coal tax, and he would like to see Wales get back some of her own. The Secretary for the Board of Education had spoken as if this was to be only an educational museum. This museum was to be a great collection of national treasures, and, he hoped, would be so situated as to be easily accessible to his constituents in Monmouthshire. It should be a temple in which was enshrined whatsoever was instructive or of historical value to the people of the Principality. His constituents would have no objection to the museum being placed at Cardiff. The people of Monmouthshire were unanimous as to the advisability of there being a museum. As a proof of their interest in things historical, he named the case of the village of Caerleon, only four miles from Newport, where there was a very valuable collection of Roman antiquities housed in a museum built by private contributions; and at Caerwent, on the other side of Newport, excavations were going on, and a fine collection of historic remains might be expected to be gleaned. Three years ago it was his privilege to be in Paris, when a Welsh choir was taking part in musical exercises. There were choirs from Austria, Belgium, Germany, and other places. At first the Chairman of the Court of Judges was not for listening to this body of musical miners, but on hearing them he bore witness to the excellent artistic training of the Welsh people, and declared that Wales was the only artistic corner of the British Empire. As all Parties in that House seemed unanimous, he (the speaker) would not labour the question, but heartily joined with the mover of the Motion in the appeal he made to the Government.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HAYES FISHER, Fulham) said that in almost every year since 1894 there had been a debate on this subject in the House, and the debate of this year presented exactly the same characteristics as the debates of former years. The Motion had been supported by speeches of great grace, charm, fascination, and sincerity, while on the part of the representative of the Board of Education sympathy had been expressed. He could not help thinking that he would be well advised to follow previous examples, and that he would perhaps be only walking into further pitfalls by attempting to take the matter beyond the stage of "sympathetic consideration" at which all his predecessors had left it. He had, however, come to the conclusion that, in spite of the eloquent speeches and sympathetic consideration, no progress could be reported; and he thought he knew the reason. There had been too little definiteness of aim, and a failure to follow up by concrete action and plan the abstract opinion so often expressed. Hon. Members had asked that similar provision in the matter of museum grants should be made for Wales to that which was made for Scotland and Ireland, but whenever they had argued that whatever reasons could be given in favour of Scotland or Ireland receiving such treatment might be urged with equal propriety in the case of Wales, they had invariably been met with the jocular retort that there was no recognised capital in Wales in which a museum could be established. As regarded the capital of Wales, he admitted that this was a very important question, but it was not an insuperable obstacle, although he was not going to give his own opinion as to what place ought to be the capital of Wales. In the discussion, he caught the names of Cardiff, Newport, Pembroke, and other places which had been suggested as the capital by hon. Members. He congratulated the mover of the Motion upon having had the courage to name Cardiff as the capital of Wales, but he would not express any opinion upon this point. Neither would he attempt to ride off on the question of nationality. He would not enter into the argument as to whether Wales had similar claims to Scotland or Ireland on the ground of separate nationality, yet every one would agree in discerning well-marked characteristics in Welsh life, literature, and antiquities, and would agree that some kind of central institution in Wales, such as a museum, might be a good medium for developing local pride and patriotism, and might warrant the expenditure of the money of the taxpayer. At the same time he could not accept the argument put forward by the hon. Member for Flint Boroughs in regard to the coal tax. If that argument were permitted he should be forced to subsidise foreign museums, as the coal-tax was paid by the foreigner. According to his argument, if the coal tax were repealed, then the grant to the Welsh museum ought to be withdrawn. He was aware that the hon. Member for Flint Boroughs had advanced many sound arguments before, but he had now advanced in regard to the coal tax what he considered to be a very fallacious one. If it were possible for the local interest in this movement to settle their capital so much the better; but if they could not define their capital they might at least define their demands, and make up their minds what sort of an institution they required, and whether they required an art gallery, a library for the valuable manuscripts, a geological museum, or a mineralogical museum.

There had been delay in dealing with this matter, but what had the Chancellor of the Exchequer up to this time had before him? Why nothing but the very fluid Motions of this House that Wales should be placed on a similar footing with England and Ireland. It was not the business of the Treasury to take notice of Motions of this kind, and formulate schemes for England, Scotland, or Wales. It was not the business of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to provide a museum, which had never been defined, for a collection which had never been collected, or to go into the market to purchase objects of art for a Welsh museum. He contended that that was not the position of the Treasury, and it was not the position which any Government should be expected to take up. If the Welsh Members of Parliament really desired to make further progress with this matter they should endeavour to define and formulate their request with more accuracy. If any museum or anything of the sort should be set up in Wales it had been suggested in previous debates, but not to-night, that objects of great interest associated with Wales should be brought back from London and placed in such a museum in Wales. He did not think such a request would be made by any patriotic Welshman, because everyone who was proud of Wales would also be proud of the fact that some of those evidences of Welsh antiquity and art should be placed in the great national museum in which they had as great a share as Englishmen, Scotchmen, or Irishmen.

He agreed that if a museum were set up in Wales certain objects might be returned to that country where they would be more seen and utilised. Hon. Members for Wales asked that they should be placed in a similar position to Dublin and Edinburgh, and knowing those galleries himself he did not wonder that they were envious of them. He would remind hon. Members, however, that the origin and growth of those libraries took place under very difficult circumstances and that the growth was of a gradual kind. Both in Dublin and Edinburgh those galleries and collections owed their origin to a large extent to private energy and benefaction. The State did not initiate them, although it came in and grafted grants upon local efforts. He would recommend that example to hon. Members who took a great interest in this question. Perhaps in time an institution such as they had in Edinburgh and Dublin might grow up in Wales. The hon. Member for Carnarvon held out hopes that local contributions would be forthcoming if they could get any encouragement from Imperial sources. His hon. friend behind him said he felt sure that the patriotism of Wales would produce a great contribution to any large centre or storehouse for works of art in Wales. The hon. Member for East Glamorgan had stated that in Wales there were a great many ancient manuscripts and other valuable documents, and that in consequence of fire two large collections had already perished; and he further stated that if a large building were erected many gentlemen would be glad to be relieved of the responsibility of keeping them. Those opinions held out hopes that if the Government gave some contribution it would be met by a corresponding effort on the part of those patriotic Welshmen who were really interested in finding some such centre.

Under the circumstances, sympathising as he did with the general object of the Motion, and being desirous of carrying the matter at least one stage forward, he would suggest to hon. Members that those who took an interest in this question on both sides of the House, and outside the House, should form a representative Committee; and that they should then define as closely as they could the nature of the institution suggested and the objects which they wished it to serve. He would advise them, in the first place, to define accurately whether they wanted a library or a museum for a geological collection. [AN HON. MEMBER: That will depend upon the amount of money.] They might define whether they wanted a museum for a mineralogical collection, or an art gallery or a building for a general storehouse for antiquities.

He asked for the production of some such substantive scheme. It would also be wise to show that they were desirous and capable of forming some kind of collection which was distinctly and essentially Welsh as a nucleus, and when they had agreed upon some such scheme, if they could formulate an estimate showing the capital expenditure and the annual outlay required, then they would be in a position to approach the Government with a substantive scheme upon which some definite reply could be given. Of course the building ought to be adapted to extension, although at first they should have regard only to the actual needs and to the probable developments for the next few years. As a most important condition they should use their best endeavours to show some local contribution either in money or in kind. He believed that if a strong Committee of that kind, armed with a definite scheme of moderate dimensions, came to the Chancellor of the Exchequer they would meet with something more than sympathetic consideration, and they would feel that they had that night laid the foundation stone of a building in which future generations of Welshmen might feel a legitimate pride.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said that Welsh Members were exceedingly obliged to the hon. Member for Fulham, because he had really by his statement carried the matter a considerable step further. The hon. Gentleman had complained rather of the vagueness of their suggestions, but he was not quite sure that the hon. Member's suggestions were not equally vague. What he understood the Secretary to the Treasury to say was, that if the Welsh Members submitted a practical proposal to the Treasury, they would receive a money grant, and that he was authorised to pledge the Treasury to that extent.

*MR. HAYES FISHER replied that he could not, as Financial Secretary, pledge the Treasury to that extent. He had had some conversation on the subject with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and although he was not prepared to give an absolute pledge, he might say that he was authorised by the right hon. Gentleman to state that if hon. Members would frame some definite estimate of the capital and the annual outlay required, it would receive something more than sympathetic consideration.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he understood the hon. Member's hesitation in giving a pledge, but he thought they all knew what was meant. He did not think there would be any difficulty at all, for they would all be preparing their various schemes. They had heard the usual speech from the Board of Education. The representative of the Board of Education said that whereas Cardiff used to get £36 last year, it actually got £74 now. They had heard of the great increase in the national expenditure, and probably this accounted for it to a certain extent. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would use his influence to curb this reckless extravagance in Wales. In regard to this museum he did not think there would be any difficulty about the capital. The Financial Secretary to the Treasury had suggested that they ought to go on and grow up gradually, and when they had grown up to a proper size, the Treasury would give them a little pocket money. In Cardiff they had already got what the hon. Member had asked for. They had got a splendid connection, which was increasing from year to year, of old Welsh manuscripts. The Financial Secretary to the Treasury had asked them to define their request, and state whether they wanted a museum, what sort of museum, whether they wanted a museum of mummies, or geological curiosities. He asked them to state whether they wanted a library, and what sort of library, or whether they would prefer an art gallery. His reply to that was that they wanted the whole lot.

He agreed with what his hon. friend the Member for Newport had stated, and if the Treasury gave them the money they would spend it properly, and where they saw a good object they would buy it. There were curiosities which did not find their way to the British Museum which would find their way to a Welsh Museum. All that ought to be left to the body which would have control of the money, and they should not dictate as to whether £1,000 must be devoted to buying mummies or anything else. That was not the way to establish a museum, for they must trust the body created to establish something which would be useful. They had got now an Education Act in Wales, for which they were not particularly grateful, but here was an opportunity for the right hon. Gentleman to grease the wheels of the Act, which were creaking very badly at present. Under that Act they were establishing a kind of central Committee representing the whole of the Welsh counties. He did not wish the Secretary to the Treasury to say that the museum should be at Cardiff, Pembroke or Monmouth, but he would suggest he should leave that question to the central body. His own opinion was that it would go to Cardiff, because it would be a case of "To him that hath shall be given." He had no doubt about that, but nevertheless it was not for the House to judge upon a matter of that kind. That was simply a local matter, and Cardiff had shown more enterprise than any other part of the Principality in such matters, and he had just heard that they were on the point of establishing a museum. The hon. Gentleman might rely upon it that if he gave a grant of money to Wales the Welsh people would double, treble, and even quadruple it. Whenever money had been given by the Treasury on the honourable understanding that the Welsh people were to find more in order to make it a success, they had never been disappointed in that respect. He was aware that £4,000 had been given to their colleges, but that was a mere pittance compared with what the Welsh people had found themselves. He desired to thank the hon. Member for the promise he had made.

Mr. WILLIAM JONES said that after the more than sympathetic promise of a contribution, with the permission of his hon. friend who seconded, he would ask leave to withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

BANK HOLIDAYS (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Sir Frederick Banbury (Camberwell, Peckham) in the Chair.]

On Clause I.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) moved to insert in line 5, after "1871," the following words: "and the Holidays Extension Act, 1875."

This was agreed to.

Mr. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) moved to insert in line 7 after "week-day" the following words: "and if a Sunday, the next day following."

This was also agreed to.

The House resumed, and the Bill as amended was reported, to be considered to-morrow.

PUBLIC HOUSES (HOURS OF CLOSING) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

***Sir JOHN LENG** (Dundee) said the supporters of the Bill were representatives on both sides of the House of large constituencies in Scotland. The object of the Bill was very simple, and at the same time of great moment to the moral and social welfare of Scotland. At this time, when it might almost be said that on both sides of the House they were all in favour of measures tending to promote temperance, he trusted that the Second Reading would be carried by general assent. The Bill which it proposed to amend was passed sixteen years ago, and the clause it was now intended to enact was passed in that House. The Bill went up to another place and it was only in the last days of the session that it was returned with that clause omitted. There was no time or opportunity in that House to reinstate it. Unfortunately since that time, by the fortune of the ballot, there had been no proper opportunity of bringing the subject before the House. The object of the Bill was to enable towns with above 50,000 inhabitants to do what was optional in all the other towns of Scotland, namely, to close public houses at ten o'clock. The experience of all the towns where the Act had been enforced had been, according to almost universal opinion, most satisfactory. The Chief Inspector of Constabulary for Scotland had year after year reiterated the opinion that it would tend greatly to reduce crime and offences in the large cities and towns of Scotland if the same rule were applied there. The general opinion of the magistrates who administered justice in the large towns of Scotland was that the last hour, from ten to eleven, was the worst in the twenty-four so far as the ruinous effects of drink were concerned. Those who were most desirous to advance the moral and social well-being of the country were most anxious that the same option as was exercised throughout Scotland generally—it was not imperative—should be left in the hands of the local magistrates in the large cities and towns: to determine whether ten o'clock closing should be enforced. He begged to move the Second Reading of the Bill.

Notice taken that forty Members were not present; House counted, and forty Members not being present,

The House was adjourned at half an hour after Ten of the clock till To-morrow.

Adjourned at half after Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 11*th March*, 1903.

The House met at Two of the clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Blackheath and Greenwich District Electric Light Bill; London Hydraulic Power Bill; Market Drayton Gas Bill; read a second time, and committed.

STANDING ORDERS.

Ordered, that Dr. Farquharson be discharged from the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

Ordered, that Mr. Buchanan be added to the Committee.—(*Mr. John Ellis.*)

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (TRAMWAYS AND IMPROVEMENTS) BILL.

"To enable the London County Council to construct and work tramways in the county of London; to make street improvements; and to acquire and use lands for the purposes of a station or stations for generating electric energy; to empower the Council of the metropolitan borough of Woolwich to widen and improve Well Hall Road; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

STRABANE AND LETTERKENNY RAILWAY BILL.

"To authorise the construction of railways in the counties of Tyrone and Donegal between Strabane and Letterkenny; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

WIGAN CORPORATION TRAMWAYS.

Report [10th March] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Francis Powell and Lord Balcarres.

HARROW ROAD AND PADDINGTON TRAMWAYS.

Report [10th March] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Atherley-Jones, Sir Ernest Spencer, and Mr. Bigwood.

CROYDON AND DISTRICT ELECTRIC TRAMWAYS.

Report [10th March] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Guthrie and Major Seely.

SHEFFIELD CORPORATION.

Report [10th March] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Stuart-Wortley and Mr. Batty Langley.

LANARKSHIRE AND DUMBARTONSHIRE RAILWAY.

Report [10th March] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Wylie and Colonel Denny.

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT RAILWAY (VARIOUS POWERS).

Report [10th March] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Perks and Sir Charles Dalrymple.

MULLINGAR, KELLS, AND DROGHEDA RAILWAY BILL.

Report [10th March] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill to be read a second time.

BECKENHAM URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

Petition for additional Provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Leeds; Devon and Exeter; Chester and North Wales; and Birmingham; to lie upon the Table.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Portpatrick; Eddrachillis; Stoneykirk; Auldearn; Stranraer; Dunsyre; and Biggar; to lie upon the Table.

DESTITUTE ADULT BLIND.

Petition from Leith, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Mawdsley, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petitions against: from Newport (Mon.); Haworth; Gateshead; Exeter; Isle of Thanet; and Wallsend; to lie upon the Table.

VAGRANTS (COMPULSORY VACCINATION AND RE-VACCINATION).

Petition from Congleton, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (DOCKYARD EXPENSE ACCOUNTS, 1901–2).

Annual Accounts presented, for 1901-2, of Shipbuilding and Dockyard Transactions, etc., with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 68.]

NAVAL WORKS ACTS, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1899, AND 1901.

Account presented, showing the amount of money issued out of the Consolidated Fund; the amount and nature of the Securities created in respect thereof; the amount of the surplus of Income over Expenditure for the financial year ended 31st March, 1896, and the amount of money expended in pursuance of the Acts during the year ended the 31st March, 1902; together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 70.]

NAVY (VICTUALLING YARD MANUFACTURING ACCOUNTS, 1901–2).

Annual Accounts presented, of the cost of manufacturing, provisions, victualling stores, etc., at the Home Victualling Yards and Malta Yard for 1901–2, etc., with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 71.]

ARMY.

Copy presented, of officers compulsorily retired or dismissed the Service [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House—

LOAN SOCIETIES.

Abstract of Accounts of Loan Societies in England and Wales to 31st December, 1901, furnished to the Central Office for the Registry of Friendly Societies [by Act].

PUBLIC WORSHIP REGULATION AND CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

Address for "Return of the number of the representations made to the bishop of every diocese in England and Wales under the eighth Section of the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, from the 31st day of December, 1898, up to the end of the year 1902; and also the number of cases in which the bishop to whom the representation was made was of opinion that proceedings should not be taken on the representation; and also for a copy in the last-mentioned cases of the representation, and of the statement deposited in the registry of the diocese showing the reason for the opinion of the bishop (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 212, of Session 1899)."—(*Mr. Heywood Johnstone.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Construction of a Bridge at Applecross, Ross-shire.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that the people of Applecross are unable to reach the parish church and churchyard except by wading the river, will he state to what extent the Congested Districts Board are prepared to assist in the construction of a bridge.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) It is impossible to say to what extent the Congested Districts Board might be willing to assist in the construction of a bridge over the Applecross water until the applicants do finally make up their minds as to what they want, and can establish the necessity for, and public benefit to be derived from, such a work.

Telegraphic Communication with Westray, Orkney.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): To ask the Postmaster General if the attention of the Government has been directed to the fact that the Island of Westray, Orkney, has been cut off from telegraphic communication for the last week, and if every effort will be made to restore communication at the earliest possible date.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) My attention has been directed to the interruption of the cable between Sanday and Westray, and a cable ship will be employed to repair it as soon as possible. For some weeks past the state of the weather has been such as to make cable-repairing operations very hazardous in those waters.

Promotion in the Dublin Post Office.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that the positions of sorter tracers are filled in Dublin by transfers; will he explain why a proportionate number of these vacancies are not reserved for postmen's limited competition; and can he arrange that postmen shall receive a share of these vacancies in future.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The fourteen vacancies for sorter tracers in Dublin created under the revision last year were advertised in the Post Office Circular, as it was desired to secure immediately candidates already holding Civil Service certificates as learners. No postman had qualified for such certificate at any of the recent examinations, but for future vacancies postmen will be able to compete with other candidates.

Dublin Post Office—Sorters' Duties.

Mr. NANNETTI: To ask the Postmaster General whether he will explain why the 7s. allowanced sorting postmen in Dublin are withdrawn from the duties to which they were appointed previous to the Tweedmouth Commission, as sub-sorters, to do the work of wheeling trucks and the transferring of news baskets in the sorting office; and can he arrange that this work may be done by assistant and junior postmen.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) It was found desirable, in the course of the recent revision in the sorting office at Dublin, to arrange that certain postmen, who had allowances of 7s. a week merged in their wages under the Tweedmouth revision, should rotate on duties which included some work such as that described; and I see no reason for disturbing the arrangement.

India—Pay of Royal Army Medical Corps.

Dr. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the rates of pay of officers of the Royal Army Medical Corps in India, sanctioned by the Government of India in accordance with the Royal Warrant of 28th March, 1902, are now being received by those officers; and, if not, when the new rates will come into force.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) The increased rates of pay of lieutenants and captains of the Royal Army Medical Corps serving in India take effect from the 24th November last.

Increased Charge on Army Estimates.

Sir EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the recent increase of the Army and of modifications in terms of pay and pension, any calculation has been made as to the future effect of these changes on the Non-Effective Votes of the Army Estimates.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Ritchie.*) In all schemes for increases to the Army calculations are always made as to the non-effective charges that will result therefrom. It is not clear to what reference is made, but the recent modifications in the terms of service and pay are not expected to cause any addition to he Non-Effective Votes of the Army.

Pensions of Naval Schoolmasters.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the increased pension to chief petty officers will be inclusive of naval schoolmasters.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The reply to this Question is in the affirmative.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Boer Prisoners at Ceylon.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many Boer prisoners of war are at present detained in Ceylon, and under what circumstances are they now detained, and when are they to be sent back to South Africa.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): Perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to answer the Question.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Mr. Speaker, I must ask for a ruling from you. This is a Question which comes under the purview of the Secretary of State for War. But it is to be answered, not by that right hon. Gentleman, nor by the Colonial Secretary, but by a Gentleman who is simply repeating the information which he has obtained at the Colonial Office. As this is a matter affecting personal liberty, I am perfectly justified in deferring the Question until the Colonial Secretary returns.

*MR. SPEAKER: If the right hon. Gentleman is reading the information which he has obtained at the Colonial Office it seems to me that he is the proper Minister to answer the Question.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (for MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN): There are at present about thirty Boer prisoners in Ceylon who have refused to take the oath or make the declaration of allegiance. They will not be sent back to South Africa unless they take the oath or make the declaration; but as soon as they do so they will be sent back at the first opportunity.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Will these prisoners be allowed to go to some other country?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Any application of that kind will be considered. I think there would be no difficulty in acceding to it.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Such an application has already been made and refused.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that twenty Boer prisoners of war in Ceylon who, on refusing to take the oath of allegiance, were to have been allowed to proceed to Java and settle there as colonists have been placed in prison because they refused unanimously to leave Ceylon, while a Mr. Tremlett, a former British subject, who had before the war become a naturalised subject of the South African Republic, and had fought on the side of the Boers in the recent war and had been taken prisoner and was in confinement with other Boer prisoners of war in Ceylon, had been refused his liberty and was about to be put on his trial for high treason; and will he say whether accounts have reached the War Office authorities of the treatment to which the Boer prisoners of war in Ceylon have been subjected; and whether he intends to take any, and, if so, what steps for their liberation and return to South Africa.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Twenty prisoners of war were to have left Ceylon, by their own wish, for Java. At the last moment they refused to leave Ceylon, while Tremlett, who was then understood to be an English rebel, was detained. It has since been ascertained that Tremlett was naturalised as a burgher of the late South African Republic before the war and it is not proposed to prosecute him. Tremlett and the others escaped from the prisoner of war camp and were lodged in Colombo gaol for safe custody. It is not known to what treatment the hon. Member refers.

Subsequently—

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said: I desire to ask the Secretary of State for War, to whom I have addressed Questions on a matter coming distinctly within the purview of his office—namely, the liberty and treatment of a little short of 1,000 men who are at present in India, Bermuda, and Ceylon as Boer prisoners of war; whether the custody and control of these prisoners of war rests with the Colonial Office or with the War Department; and, if with the War Department, I wish to ask why the Secretary of State for War does not answer my Questions with reference to these men instead of leaving them to be answered by the Colonial Office.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The hon. Member has asked me a perfectly new Question, and I suggest he should put it down on the Paper.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Having regard to that answer, may I, by way of personal explanation, state that I asked questions with a similar bearing the day before yesterday, and they were answered by the representative of the Colonial Office?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is not a matter of personal explanation.

Army Establishment—Pay of Excess Troops.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War under what constitutional or Parliamentary authority the pay of 12,000 troops in excess of establishment, and in excess of the number authorised by Parliament, was paid.

MR. BRODRICK: If my hon. friend will kindly turn to page 11 of the Army Estimates he will find that Parliament voted 420,000 men for 1902-3. The number 12,000 represents the surplus over the normal, but is of course due to war. Pending the reduction to normal figures a temporary surplus of men is included in the Estimates for 1903-4.

Officers' Uniforms.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office, in reference to the circular issued by his Department to a certain number of firms of tailors asking for terms for supplying officers with uniforms, whether circulars were sent to any tailor firms in Dublin, in Cork, or in Limerick; and, if not, will he explain why Irish firms have been excluded.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): Yes, Sir, circulars were sent to Irish firms of good standing. Any firm of good standing is at liberty to send in price lists to the War Office.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Will the noble Lord say what commission the War Office makes out of this transaction?

No answer was returned.

H.M.S. "Hannibal"—Oil Fuel Trials.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state generally the results so far of the trial of oil fuel on H.M.S. "Hannibal" in respect to freedom from smoke, speed, and cost as compared with best smokeless Welsh coal, and also as regards percolation through the storage tanks.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The oil fuel trials in the "Hannibal" have so far only entered their initial stages, the immediate object being to ascertain the practicability of realising full power with this fuel in the boilers fitted for burning it, irrespective of smoke, speed, or cost. The results obtained, though not unattended by difficulties, are considered promising; but no definite conclusions on the points specified will be possible until more prolonged trials have been made, and experience had of its working at sea.

New Army Rifle—Adoption by Admiralty.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, have the Admiralty considered the new rifle adopted for the Army with a view to deciding whether it is advisable to adopt it for the Navy; will they, before coming to a decision, submit this rifle to trials in order to ascertain the effect of the increased recoil upon accuracy of shooting; and will they, before finally adopting the rifle, lay any reports they may receive of such trials on the Table of this House.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Admiralty have very carefully considered the new rifle, and it has been passed through exhaustive trials in the three Gunnery Schools and in all Marine Divisions. The question of recoil, and all other points connected with the shooting of the rifle have been considered, and in view of the advantages which the rifle possesses, and of the favourable reports respecting it, it is proposed to adopt it for the Navy. The Admiralty do not propose to lay any report of the trials upon the Table of the House.

H.M.S. "Russell."

Mr. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state the nature of the defects which prevent H.M.S. "Russell" from proceeding to join the Mediterranean Fleet.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The defect which prevented H.M.S. "Russell" proceeding to sea was the inefficient working of the evaporators, on account of the priming. Satisfactory trials were made yesterday, and it is hoped the ship will proceed to-day (Wednesday), if not prevented by fog.

Sir WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): Why was not the inefficiency of the evaporators ascertained before the vessel was taken over by the Admiralty?

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: They were tried before being taken over, and no difficulty at all arose. It is supposed that the impurity of the water at Sheerness caused the difficulty, which has now ceased.

Sir WILLIAM ALLAN: Was it the boilers or evaporators that primed?

Mr. ARNOLD-FOSTER: It was the evaporators which primed, and not the boilers. But they were fully tested.

Sir WILLIAM ALLAN: I may inform the hon. Gentleman that evaporators do not prime.

Aden Hinterland.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any, and, if so, how many additional troops have been sent to the Aden Hinterland; and at what cost; and how long are they expected to remain there?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Lord George Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing): The Dublin Regiment, which would have left Aden in the ordinary course on being relieved by the Hampshire Regiment, has been detained there in connection with the delimitation. In addition, a regiment of Native Infantry and two Mountain Batteries, one Native and one British, have been sent from India to Aden. I am at present unable to state the cost. I hope that a settlement may be shortly arrived at which will enable the additional troops to be withdrawn.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: Cannot the noble Lord give any indication as to how long the troops will be detained?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The time the troops will be detained depends on the settlement of the question.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Are these warlike operations under the control of the India Office or of the War Office?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I demur to the statement that they are warlike operations; but they are under the control of the India Office.

United States—Immigration of Aliens.

Mr. MARSHALL HALL (Lancashire, Southport): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to the fact that the United States Senate has approved the measure lately adopted by the House of Representatives imposing further restrictions upon alien immigration into the United States; and whether he will say what steps will be taken to prevent the deportation to this country of any persons so rejected who are not of British nationality.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): The answer to the first Question is in the affirmative. The subject of the deportation to this country of persons not of British nationality is now before the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): Do I understand my noble friend, that the Government do not intend to take any immediate steps?

LORD CRANBORNE: Well, it is not usual to deal with a matter while it is being inquired into by a Royal Commission.

Slavery in the Congo Free State.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British Consuls or other officials or agents in the Congo State and adjoining districts have been, or will be, directed to report to His Majesty's Government as to the illegal punishments and cruelties repeatedly alleged to be inflicted by the officials of the Congo State upon the natives; whether, if so, such reports will be laid before Parliament; and whether any representations have been made on this subject to the Belgian Government.

MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): May I at the same time ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official reports showing that slavery exists in the Congo State through the connivance, or by the acts, of the State officials, and of cruelties perpetrated upon the natives by the officials of the State; and, if so, do the Government propose to take any steps to enforce the regulations of the Berlin Conference of 1885, by which the native races were to be protected.

LORD CRANBORNE: I will answer both Questions together. We have no reason to think that slavery is recognised by the authorities of the Congo Free State, but reports of acts of cruelty and oppression have reached us. Such reports have been received from our Consular officers, but our information is not very complete, and it would be premature to consider the propriety of laying Papers before Parliament. I am not sure to what regulations the hon. Member for the Spalding Division refers other than Article VI. of the Berlin Act, which is undoubtedly binding on the Congo Free State. As I intimated to the House on the 2nd instant His Majesty's Government are not at present contemplating any action based upon that Article.†

Government Departments—Distribution of Work.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can now say what form the inquiry to be instituted into the position of certain public offices and the distribution of the work of Government Departments generally will take; if he will provide by specific reference that a Report shall be made on the advisability of equalising the scales of salaries of first division officials in all Departments in accordance with the recommendations of the Playfair and Ridley Commission; and will he consider the desirability of suspending any further transfer of functions between the Departments pending the inquiry.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The matter is now receiving careful consideration, but I am not at present in a position to make any statement.

Boy Recruits—Case of Frank Glover.

MR. BELL (Derby): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that a boy named Frank Glover, fifteen years of age, who was sent to the Industrial (Boys') School, Bristol, four years ago, has been compelled to join the Army, and is now in the Royal Artillery Band, Woolwich, against his own and his father's wishes; and whether, seeing that his father has applied for his discharge and been refused, he will take steps to get the boy returned to his father as early as possible.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxviii., 1107.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): As I informed the hon. Member by letter last October, when he brought the case to my notice, it is not the fact that this boy was enlisted against his own wish. Glover joined an Army Band by his own desire, and I have no doubt that the managers of the school, in exercising their powers under the Reformatory and Industrial Schools Act of 1891, acted in the best interests of the boy. The father's request for Glover's release on licence was refused chiefly on the ground that another son had recently returned home from an industrial school, and was wandering about Derby apparently beyond his father's control. I cannot interfere in the matter.

MR. BELL: I think the facts as stated by the right hon. Gentleman are not quite correct, and will the right hon. Gentleman receive a statement from me?

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: Yes, I shall be glad to consider any representations made to me.

The London and Globe Finance Corporation Prosecution.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Home Secretary what steps, if any, are being taken by the authorities to prevent any attempt to escape from criminal justice by Mr. Whitaker Wright.

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: The hon. Member has given me no notice of that Question. He had better put it on the Paper.

St. Louis Exposition—Western Highland Tweed Exhibits.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, with a view to encourage the manufacture of homespun tweeds in the Western Highlands, the Secretary for Scotland will consider the expediency of having this industry represented at the forthcoming St. Louis Exposition.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The Secretary for Scotland has been in communication with the Scottish Home Industries Association. They do not at present contemplate any such course as suggested by the hon. Member.

Ennis Labourers' Cottages Scheme.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will inquire into the delay by the Local Government Board in sanctioning the erection of labourers' cottages in the Ennis district.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The delay has been caused by the failure of the District Council to obtain and forward promptly the written consents of owners and occupiers concerned where there has been a change in selected sites, also to certain discrepancies between the scheme and maps not explained by the Council and its engineer.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Was this the sole cause of the delay? I am informed it was not.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have heard no other cause suggested.

Roxboro Road School, Limerick.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can give the name of any auditor of the Local Government Board who reported that the expenditure in the repairs of the Roxboro Road Schools of the rent by the Commissioners was proper and legal; or whether he can say if the auditor's attention has been called to that point; also whether, now that the accumulated rents are about to be applied for the purposes of technical education in Limerick, can he arrange that the £198 spent in repairs shall be brought in also.

MR. WYNDHAM: The payments out of the accumulated funds were made by the Commissioners in the exercise of their discretion. They have acted under the law as administered by the Court of Chancery in reference to the management of trust property by trustees. It was not the duty of the auditor, Mr. Mayne, to question their decision in the matter. He merely satisfied himself that the money had been expended, and proper receipts obtained. The hon. Member is incorrect in assuming that the unexpended funds are about to be applied to the purposes of technical education. The Commissioners are prepared to consider any suggestion made to them to this effect. The reply to the concluding inquiry is in the negative.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Had not the Inspector of the Local Government Board power to find out whether these payments were legal, or is he content with the production of the receipt?

MR. WYNDHAM: I understand that is so. The Commissioners have fulfilled all the obligations imposed by law.

MR. JOYCE: Will the right hon. Gentleman see that there is no difficulty thrown in the way of the people getting their own money back?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not think that that issue arises on the facts.

MR. JOYCE: Well I do, so there is a difference of opinion between us.

Land Purchase in County Leitrim—Gillmor's Lands.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that the lands purchased by Mr. Stuart Gillmor, of Dromahair, county Leitrim, and for the purchase of which the Land Commission advanced £480 under terms of an agreement dated 24th July, 1902, were not demesne lands, and that the person who was in possession of a portion of these lands at the time this agreement was perfected was liable for the rates due upon it, an inquiry will be instituted into the circumstances surrounding this sale.

MR. WYNDHAM: The purchase agreement made with Mr. Gillmor shows that he was in occupation of the holding since 1880. No sub-tenancy appears to have existed in the case, and no inquiry, such as suggested, is considered necessary.

MR. O'DOWD: Will the right hon. Gentleman cause further inquiries to be made?

MR. WYNDHAM: No; I cannot inquire into the action of the Land Commission.

Cladnageragh Pier.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a memorial signed by the clergy of all denominations and principal inhabitants of Kilcar and the fishermen of Cladnageragh, urging the extension of Cladnageragh Pier from a distance of fourteen feet to a distance of sixty-one feet beyond low-water mark, in order to expedite the unloading of the boats and delivery for large centres and of goods for Kilcar at a cheaper rate by steamer at Cladnageragh; and whether, having regard to his acknowledgment on the occasion of his recent visit to Kilcar of the need of pier extension at Cladnageragh, he will take any, and what, steps to provide for the carrying out of the work.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir; the memorial was received. The result of my inspection of this pier, and of my inquiries into the needs of the district, has led me to view with much favour the proposal that the pier should be extended. I am anxious to carry out the work under the provisions of the recent statute. The County Council, I understand, would prefer that a work of greater magnitude, entailing largely increased expenditure, should be undertaken at Malin Head. The question of cost is of course a main factor for consideration before a determination can be arrived at, and I am at present in correspondence with the Council on the entire subject.

Rathmines Police Rate.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the valuation of Rathmines, county Dublin, was in 1851, £39,728, and the police rate 8d. in the pound; that in 1902 the valuation of Rathmines, including Rathgar and Miltown, was £160,000, and the police rate 8d. in the pound; and will he say whether the police force of the township has been augmented, and to what extent; whether the increase has absorbed the rate levied upon £160,000; and, if not, what is the surplus, and to what fund has it been credited.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The earliest valuation of Rathmines and Rathgar, of which there is any official record, is for the year 1868, when it was £75,033. In 1902 it was £156,672. The police rate in 1851 was 7d. in the pound, and 8d. last year. The strength of the police force allotted to the township in 1851 cannot be ascertained. It is believed, however, there has been no material change in the force within the period mentioned. No separate account is kept by the Commissioner of Police showing the revenue from police tax in the contributory townships.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: What is the necessity for charging four times more than was charged thirty years ago?

Mr. WYNDHAM'S answer was inaudible.

Land Purchase in County Wicklow.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the cause of the delay in delivering to Miss Hefferman, of Ballycurragh, county Wicklow, the deed of conveyance of her farm which she purchased two years ago, the purchase money having been paid in June, 1902.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The purchase money in this case was not lodged in the Land Judge's Court until the 8th January last. The order vesting he holding in Miss Hefferman will be executed during the present week.

Phœnix Park, Dublin.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that during the recent storm 1,242 forest trees and 1,706 thorn trees were blown down in the Phœnix Park, Dublin; whether the Board intend to dispose of this timber by sale, and, if so, to what fund will the proceeds be credited; and whether the Board of Works will take steps to replant this area.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir; irreparable damage has been done in what, I suppose, is the finest public park in the world. The proceeds from sale of the timber will be appropriated in aid of the vote. Replanting cannot be undertaken before the autumn.

Proposed Forth-Clyde Canal.

Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the National Defence Committee have considered, or will consider, the propriety of the formation of a ship canal between the rivers Forth and Clyde, so that ships of war may freely pass from the new naval base on the Forth to the river Clyde, thus creating a second naval base on the Clyde, and benefiting the merchant ships trading between the east and west coasts of England and Scotland.

The PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour (Manchester, E.): This subject has not come before the Defence Committee, and I cannot give any pledge that it will be taken into early consideration.

House of Commons—Hour of Meeting.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will, with a view to promoting the personal convenience and comfort of Ministers and Members, and without interference with the public service, take into consideration a proposal for fixing the hour for the meeting of the House for half-past two instead of two o'clock on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays, and for the termination of Questions for 3.25 instead of 2.55.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the reduction in the number of Questions would make it possible to enable the House to meet at a quarter-past two, instead of two o'clock. [Cries of "Half-past."] I do not think it would be right to alter the rule under which public business begins at three o'clock. That block of time is really essential, in my judgment, to the proper working of the legislative machinery. Of course the change to a quarter-past two could not be made without an alteration of the Standing Order, and at the present moment I am not in a position to find time for that alteration.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that during the whole of this session Questions have never taken more than twenty minutes?

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Would not ten minutes be sufficient now for the preliminary business?

Private Business.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he proposes to take the steps needful to carry into effect the recommendations of the Select Committee on Private Business (which sat last session) which are embodied in paragraphs 37, 38, and 39 of their Report.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have been in communication with the Chairman of the Committee, who, as the House knows, is abroad. I gather that he is in favour generally of these changes, but before making any answer I should like to be able to consult him, and I must therefore defer any further answer.

Prevention of Corruption Bill.

MR. CHANNING: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether His Majesty's Government will press forward the Prevention of Corruption Bill so as to give this House an opportunity of considering the measure in time to make it possible to carry these proposals into law in the present session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: This Bill was read a second time yesterday in another place, but I can give no pledge now as to when it will be taken here.

National Food Supply in War Time.

SIR HARRY SETON-KARR (St. Helens): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now inform the House what form the promised Government inquiry into the subject of our National Food Supply in time of war will take; what will be its constitution, scope, and terms of reference; and when it will be appointed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not in a position at present to do more than answer the first part of my hon. friend's Question. The form of the inquiry will be by Royal Commission. The constitution of the Royal Commission and the terms of the reference to it I will communicate to my hon. friend and the House as soon as I am able to do so.

STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL.)

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON reported from the Chairmen's Panel: That they had appointed Mr. John Edward Ellis to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.

First Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

NEW BILL.

OUTDOOR RELIEF (PENSIONERS) BILL.

"To empower Boards of Guardians to grant Outdoor Relief to Pensioners of the Army and Navy," presented by Colonel Blundell; supported by General Laurie, Mr. Kearley, Mr. Parker Smith, Sir James Fergusson, Mr. George Ormsby-Gore, and Colonel Nolan; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 94.]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

In moving the election of the Public Accounts Committee—

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD (Somersetshire, Wellington) was understood to say he had made further inquiries into the proposed constitution of the Committee, in consequence of what fell from the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean on the preceding day. When the hon. Member for King's Lynn, the loss of whose services everybody regretted, indicated his wish not to be renominated the hon. Member for Chester was invited to fill the vacancy, and consented to do so. The various gentlemen whose names appeared in the paper had been communicated with through the usual channels, and had all expressed themselves as not only willing but anxious to serve. Under these circumstances it was not for him to put pressure on any one to retire, and he proposed not to amend the list in any way. He trusted that, as the Committee ought to get to work immediately, no opposition would be made to this proposal.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Sir Frederick Banbury, Mr. Blake, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Hayes Fisher, Mr. Goddard, Sir Brampton Gurdon, Sir Arthur Hayter, Mr. Herbert Lewis, Mr. Arthur Morton, Sir Robert Mowbray, Mr. Pym, Mr. Powell-Williams, and Mr. Yerburgh nominated Members of the Committee of Public Accounts.

Ordered that the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1903-4.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a number of Land Forces, not exceeding 235,761, all ranks, be maintained for the Service of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland at home and abroad, excluding His Majesty's Indian Possessions, during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1904."

Sir A. Acland-Hood.

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a number of Land Forces, not exceeding 208,761, be maintained for the said Service."—(*Mr. Guest.*)

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To-day we are nominally discussing in Committee of Supply what is a small Amendment, but in reality the House of Commons is called upon to pronounce one of the most momentous decisions which has ever had to be taken in Parliament, and the decision to which we shall come to-night is one which will affect to a very substantial degree our decisions on other questions which will have to be submitted to this House later on. It is not possible to imagine a decision of more far-reaching interest than the one which this Committee is invited to come to, especially in face of the gigantic Estimates for the Navy which have been laid before us. We cannot deal with this as an isolated and detached problem; we cannot separate the question of the Army Estimates from that of the Navy Estimates. I am one of those who think that the expenditure is bound to increase year by year. My hon. friend the Member for the College Division of Glasgow, speaking last night on this question of expenditure, used the words—

> "Any reduction ought to be made on other items, and not on the Army or Navy."

This suggestion carries us even further; it points to the possibility that in this debate we shall have to consider not merely the expenditure on the Army and Navy but also the general expenditure of the country. I think the hon. Baronet should have hinted at the class of expenditure which he thought might be reduced. There are proposals made by Unionist Members with regard to various matters which are in our minds which point to a very largely increased national expenditure on the Civil Service Estimates. I therefore doubt very much whether we shall be able to save money for the Army and Navy out of the Civil Service Estimates.

The Secretary of State last night accused those who are supporting this Amendment of a desire for the reduction of expenditure at all costs. I wish to deny both halves of that suggestion. I do not think that the advocates of the Amendment desire or expect any reduction of expenditure. It is the prevention of an increase of expenditure at which they are aiming. I deny also that they desire a reduction "at all costs," because I am certain that those who have brought forward this Amendment have shown by their utterances that they are animated by patriotism alone—that they regard the matter from a national and patriotic point of view. I am one of those who hold that peace is the greatest interest of this country, and I do not concur with my hon. friend the Member for Oldham, who sits on this side of the House, in his views of the policy which he thinks makes necessary these very large Estimates. We are face to face with the fact that, owing to the position of this country in the world, a gigantic expenditure on military and naval services is a necessity; but while we admit that, all we are frightened of is the tendency towards constant increase, an increase which is certain as regards the Navy, and one which, unless we check it, is certain as regards the Army also, and certain, I believe, to be attended with insufficient results. Not only is it certain that the naval expenditure will increase, but it is also admitted by the Secretary for War that the Army expenditure will necessarily go up under many heads, even if this reduction in the number of men is carried.

It is not necessary to go into these matters in detail, but there is one point I should like again to mention, and that is that the food of the private soldier must be raised up to at least the standard which has now been fixed for the Navy. The most useful purpose that this debate will serve is that we shall make our personal appeal to the Prime Minister, who is looking into the question, and directing the reforms of the Cabinet Committee; that he shall consider with us if the expenditure on the Army cannot be, I will not say reduced, but checked, and if it cannot be applied on different lines. Just as yesterday the Secretary for War defended the Intelligence Department to the War Office against Lord Salisbury, who was the only man to attack that Department, he also in advance defended the War Office against the arguments which he thought were to be addressed to the House by the mover of this Amendment and his friends. That defence proceeded on lines which were not exactly those of his former defence; it was not at all on the lines of his statement to the Colonial Conference. I am glad to think we have heard very little in this debate about the possibility of the invasion of this country in the event of our loss of the command at sea. That point has very properly receded into that third or fourth position which it ought to hold. The defence of the Secretary of State yesterday proceeded largely upon two points which I should like the Committee to consider, because they are matters to which we shall have continually to return. He told us that unless we retained the linked battalion system we should have inferiority in our training depôts, and he alluded to the case of India. As to the case of India I shall have something to say later on, in considering the proposals that have been put before us by the Prime Minister. It is necessary for us to face this linked battalion question. I fully admit that the Prime Minister can advance any number of arguments in favour of it when he is in the happy position of summing up the debate. I admit also that we are not entirely agreed upon it, but then I would point out that the supporters of the Government themselves are not agreed. I should like to ask the Secretary for War as to what he looks forward to in regard to this linked battalion question. There are some of us no doubt who, having been many years in Opposition, are naturally, to some extent, defenders of what have been great Liberal reforms in our time; and there is always a danger that we on this side of the House may drop into considering all the Liberal reforms as a kind of fetish to which we are absolutely bound. It is not surprising, therefore, that under all the circumstances, we should be inclined to look on the linked battalion system as such a fetish. The Cardwell reforms were great reforms in their time, but they have been essentially modified, first by Mr. Cardwell himself, then by Mr. Childers, next by Lord Hartington, and finally by the present Secretary for War during the time he was Under-Secretary. Surely the time has come when we may look upon this linked battalion system as one not quite so sacred as the Ark of the Covenant. The hon. Member for Oldham who sits on the other side of the House put forward, I think, no fewer than five different plans for avoiding the difficulties of the linked battalion system.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: (Oldham): Four.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Four—and last night the hon. Member for Plymouth made, I think, a very admirable statement, with which I agree except on one point, upon the change so far as it affects the linked-battalion system. There is undoubtedly a difference of opinion—the extent of which is not yet realised on this question. The suggestion that the difficulties of the system may be avoided by counting South Africa as home, and keeping a whole Army Corps there, was objected to by the Secretary for War as too costly, but I understand he is already trying, or intends to try, the experiment of keeping battalions at the Cape on the home footing. Has he any limit as regards the age at which recruits are to be sent to South Africa? That is a matter worthy the consideration of the Committee, because it is a notorious fact that during the war men who were too young to be sent to South Africa in the Regular service were afterwards sent as Militia, and served along with their own Regular battalions. That is a strange and artificial rule. We already enlist 2,000 men who officially are only seventeen years of age, and I have no doubt that many more are actually enlisted who are under the age. Before the war the Army medical question was frequently debated in this House, and much pressure was brought to bear on the Government in connection with it. One of the most frequent topics of remark was the prevalence of typhoid fever among young recruits in South Africa, and this is a fact which ought not to be lost sight of in considering whether we can avoid the defects of the linked battalion system in the manner to which I have referred. Undoubtedly many of the difficulties we labour under are the result of that system. In order to make it operate we are forced to keep a battalion at home for every battalion we have abroad, and consequently the strength of our home Army is regulated not by our needs but by the extent of our colonial garrisons. If you increase those garrisons you must increase the number of Regular battalions at home. Again the strength of your expeditionary force depends on the number of Regular battalions at home, so that the whole thing is a chapter of accidents. It certainly cannot be claimed for it that it is a scientific system.

I want to ask the Secretary of State for War, what his own intentions were in regard to the linked-battalion system, and how was he going to meet the difficulty he had himself raised? He said the previous day that in a period of from two to four years, he expected the Reserve would reach 100,000 men, and then it would rapidly rise to 125,000, 130,000 or 140,000 men. That was, of course, in consequence of the new departure made in adopting the three years system of enlistment. The Secretary of State for War went on to say—

> "When the Reserve reaches 100,000 then you may safely begin to reduce the number with the colours, having the minimum necessary to maintain the *cadres* in efficiency, with great effect in the reduction of our expenditure."

What did he mean by that? Must they not interrogate the Secretary of State for War and find out what he meant to do with regard to the linked battalion system. He said they were going to make a great reduction in numbers and expenditure, by reducing the number of men with the Colours in consequence of greatly strengthening the Reserves. They were to have a large reduction of men when the total reached 100,000 and they might ultimately expect a reduction of 40,000.

MR. BRODRICK: I never used the number 40,000 men.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said the Secretary of State had said that he was going to retain only the minimum number of men necessary to maintain the *cadres* in efficiency. These last words constituted the ground given for the increase of the Army. How was the right hon. Gentleman going to work the linked battalion system under his new scheme? He might tell them that he had not made up his mind. He submitted that, when that movement had been met by a suggestion that in two to four years from that time they were to have this startling change, they should not part with the Estimate until they knew the principles which were to regulate that change. The reduction moved was one of 27,000 men and the mover explained his reduction in these words: he said that the increase of infantry would be 27,907 men, out of 54,000 of an increase. That was the first time that a thought-out reduction of that kind had been moved. That Motion did not touch the increase in the artillery or the mounted men, and it had been put before the Committee by arguments which dealt very effectively with that horrible wastage in the Army. It would take them very far indeed if they were to attempt to deal at length with the question of the wastage in the Army, because it was notorious that that wastage was gigantic compared with any other foreign army; and yet one would have thought that under a system in which they did not work the men so hard, and where they did not sweep the whole population in their net by conscription, they would have been able to prevent such a gigantic wastage.

As regarded the mounted men the Secretary of State for War had made no statement this year to the House, and he had not told them what he was going to do on the line of his unsuccessful proposals of last year. They were still left with his Army Corps, provided with mounted troops for the one part by Yeomanry and one part by Regulars. Their objection to that scheme was the scratch and mixed character of the Army Corps, for it was a system in which the House of Commons had never supported the Government of the day. The right hon. Gentleman thought his scheme had been approved, but looking back to the debates he did not believe that the House of Commons had given any real approval for the creation of those mixed Army Corps at home. Now he came to the question which was suggested by the needs of those mixed Army Corps at home. They were corps which by their constitution appeared to be tied to the Islands in which they existed, and tied to Home defence, and that they were so considered by the right hon. Gentleman there could be no doubt if they considered his speeches, or in particular the speech he made at the Colonial Conference.

MR. BRODRICK: I merely pointed out at the Conference that the proposal of the Government was to be able to put 120,000 men in whatever portion of the Empire they might be needed for the defence of the Empire.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he was speaking of the other three Army Corps, that is the three mixed corps.

MR. BRODRICK: I thought the right hon. Baronet was speaking of the six Army Corps.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he was speaking of the mixed corps, composed partly of Regulars and partly of Yeomanry, Volunteers and Militia. The Prime Minister had assumed in his speeches on this subject that the increased and increasing expenditure was for the foreign service Army, and that they were obtaining a larger or more efficient foreign service expeditionary Army for time of war. He doubted that. His own impression was that apart from the great increase which would accrue a few years hence in the Reserves, now depleted—apart from that they had actually diminished the number available for foreign expeditions. Far from the numbers for foreign service being greater under the new scheme he thought they were in fact diminished. For example, the 23,000 men of the old Militia Reserve which was abolished were so available, and in the Army Corps Scheme there was no corresponding increase. Let him quote the previous declarations of the Government upon this head in the three years before the war. The Prime Minister assumed that this expenditure was for an increased expeditionary army that could be sent across the sea. The present Chief Secretary for Ireland on the 2nd March, 1899, speaking before the adoption of the six Army Corps Scheme, told the House that they had organised three Army Corps and four cavalry brigades of Regulars without any intermixture of auxiliary forces. In 1898 the present Secretary of State for War named three Army Corps of Regulars, and in 1897 the same right hon. Gentleman said that:

"We put into the field three Army Corps of Regulars, of which two are ready to embark at a moment's notice."

At the present time not more than two Army Corps could be sent abroad without colonials, and without sending for the Volunteers, Yeomanry and Militia, and the difficulty which prevented them embarking three Army Corps still existed, viz.: the Irish difficulty, which made it improbable that the third Army Corps would be moved from Ireland.

All through the scheme of the Secretary of State for War there ran this clinging of the Empire to fixed defence, and to troops which could not be freely moved about the world, and which were consequently of a lower standard of efficiency. The Secretary of State for War yesterday gave the numbers of these garrisons. He said the colonial garrison amounted to 51,000 men, and the British garrisons of Regulars in fortresses at home numbered 13,000. He placed the permanent staffs at 20,000, making a total of 84,000 men, tied as it were at home, who could not be moved among the Regular forces; and these, in addition to the recruits who could not be sent out In India they had already an enormous force of this kind. There were under the Indian mobilisation scheme no less than 160,000 Regulars who were fixed for employment in their own portion of the country, and could not be moved to the frontier in the event of war. These figures made a total of 224,000 men of the Regulars of the Imperial Army who were tied to fixed defence, as compared with any expeditionary force which they could move about the world. That had always been one of the greatest difficulties of the War Office system, and it was one which he was sure had brought this question home to the minds of many hon. Members in this House.

They had in the British Armies an overwhelming number of men. Some years ago a calculation of the troops within the Empire was made, and it worked out that they possessed nearly 1,000,000 of men of one kind and another, apart from the Irish Constabulary and military police, and without counting the marines, troops under the Colonial or the Foreign Office, and military police available in many colonies for military operations. There were nearly a million consisting of those shown in the Army Estimates, the Army Reserve, the Militia, the Volunteers, the Yeomanry, the Channel Islands Militia, Malta Militia, and other forces so shown, the Indian Army; and in addition to those shown anywhere on Army Estimates the forces of the various colonies, including the organised and drilled part of the Canadian Militia, and the army of the Colonial Office paid out of Civil Service Estimates, such as the West African Frontier Force. The number had been increased since that time, but at the present moment there was a temporary reduction in the Reserve. Substantially they might still say that the number of troops capable of serving in the field in the British Armies stood at one million men, and yet they had only the relatively small numbers produced by the War Office who could be put into the field as an organised military force. As regarded the number of these men the Secretary of State for War told them yesterday that their wish was to get rid of the small and well-tried body of Regulars, and put in their place a great number of partially trained troops. He submitted to the Committee that this inaccurately described their proposals, but accurately described the actual state of the case. It was a description the very opposite of what the hon. Member for Plymouth desired to produce. At the present time we had 1,000,000 men, supported at enormous expense in all portions of the Empire, and the result was that we had only a small striking force. Supposing the Volunteers of this country were properly organised for home defence service, the ideal would be that they should be able to send abroad the whole Regular Army of this country, and that they would be able to reinforce them by the Militia who would be ready at an interval of longer time. The Prime Minister assumed that the increased cost was for possible expeditions of Regulars across the seas, but if he looked through the constitution of his force he would see that the opposite was the case, and that the overwhelming proportion of the forces of the Empire were not for that purpose, and that by far the greater portion were not organised.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) indicated dissent.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE thought the right hon. Gentleman assumed that. He admitted that the statement was rather vague, and he would, therefore, give a definite argument which the right hon. Gentleman used to the House. He said that the great ground for the increased cost was what he called the defence of India, and what the Secretary of State for War called the defence of the North-West Frontier. The Prime Minister spoke of the absolute necessity of providing for the defence of that frontier—providing for the contingency of being militarily adjacent to a first-class military power. The right hon. Gentleman said that was the key of our own military position. What he wanted to suggest was that these words of the Prime Minister showed a certain measure of adherence to the old heresy with regard to the defensive policy of this Empire. The only way in which the British Empire could be defended, if we had not sufficiently defended it by a policy of peace, was by striking at the enemy and conquering him by offensive operations.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman assumes that I only considered one thing, and that that was the case of invasion, but if he will look at the observations I made he will see that I prefaced my observations on the question of the Indian Frontier with the remark that it was absolutely necessary that we should not be driven to a purely defensive policy, and that we must have a striking force.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that Indian defence was provided for by the Indian mobilisation scheme. That scheme provided for putting two Army Corps of Regular troops in the field, and he ventured to say that no military authority could be quoted who believed that from the present Russian frontier on the other side of Afghanistan it was possible to move any Russian or foreign force which these two Army Corps in the Indian mobilisation scheme were not able to deal with. No one who had considered the matter had ever for a moment suggested that it would be possible from the present frontier to reach India at all. If they were going to assume the partition of Afghanistan, or assume an unsuccessful war to prevent it, or going to invite it, an entirely different state of things arose; but surely it was not necessary in the military preparations of the present year to discuss a hypothetical and visionary state of affairs which he believed would never arise. He did not think we were strengthened by the recent fad for the creation of an Imperial service force. That did greatly affect the balance of power in India. He did not hestitate to say that before the creation of that force there was virtually no danger of a military mutiny. They had always been told that all they wanted against mutiny were British men in uniform, and that they did not require men of the highest training; that Militia and battalions of much less quality in the open field would be equal to that event, which he for one did not contemplate. No one had ever suggested a mutiny in India except in the actual event of an invasion of India which, to him, seemed at the present moment to be impossible. He believed that the unanimous opinion of almost all the authorities who had thought out this question was that what had been suggested was a dream, but at all events there was no military authority for it. There was no military authority for saying that Indian defence required more than two Army Corps which could mobilise.

Once on a time it was thought that Russia could be attacked by the Black Sea. It was not necessary now to discuss those suggestions because as the colonial fever increased all Powers, including Russia, appeared to become more vulnerable to our Fleet, and our Army could strike more easily than was the case some years ago. France and Germany were vulnerable to our arms, and Russia was formerly invulnerable, but Russia by expansion had become more vulnerable. He did not think they should be presented with this Indian argument as the main ground for the proposals which were made to the House. He for one believed in the necessity for a Regular Army service across the seas. He believed above all in keeping that Army in a high state of efficiency. He rejoiced especially that this Amendment did not interfere with the cavalry or artillery of such a force. In the event of war there would be a long struggle before our command of the sea was absolutely secured, and before we were able to bring the war to an end, not by defensive operations but by striking at the enemy, even at his heart. The Secretary of State for War had stated that the real question in debate was whether the Army was too large. If the right hon. Gentleman asked the Committee to consider that question he should say that, while he was not one of those who desired to cut down expenditure on both services year after year, if they were driven to choosing between the Army and the Fleet it was more important at this time to maintain a Fleet capable of preventing a coalition against us. It was more important that they should prefer the Fleet rather than have an unwieldy Army which seemed beyond their power to discipline and control.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham) said he was sure that they had all listened with the greatest possible interest to the able speech of the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. He agreed with almost every word of it. He should like to offer a few observations on this Motion, and also to express some serious objections to the right hon. Gentleman's scheme. In doing so he felt to a certain extent embarrassed because he was not altogether in sympathy with the methods by which this scheme had recently been attacked. He thought that there had been too much suggestion of falsification of returns and matters of that kind, and too little critical examination of broad principles. Personally, he had the highest esteem for the right hon. Gentleman, whose task was one of the most difficult and thankless in the Empire, and attacks of that kind only increased the sympathy he had always felt towards him in his difficult position. Recently, and particularly in the debate the day before yesterday, the right hon. Gentleman had introduced certain reforms which would give a great deal of satisfaction to those interested in the welfare of the Army. He thought the right hon. Gentleman had reason to complain of the attitude of the House, and particularly of Members of his own Party, towards the scheme which had been received with approving cheers two years ago. If the scheme was wrong—as he thought it was—in principle, they must share the blame. Most of the criticisms which had hitherto been made were of a purely destructive character Nothing was commoner, or more easy to indulge in, than destructive criticism, nor could he admit the easy contention that if they wished to destroy the existing order of things there was no moral obligation to suggest an alteration. His objections to the right hon. Gentleman's scheme might be summarised as follows: In the first place it was clearly based on the idea of an insufficient or defeated Navy; secondly it was neither flesh, fowl, nor good red herring, in that, as at present constituted, it destroyed the efficiency of both the home defence and the foreign service armies. If modified he thought it would be extremely suitable for a purely home defence force, but his contention was that it was not suitable in any way for an expeditionary force intended for service over-seas. His third objection was that it was an unreal and ineffective force, not on the grounds previously urged that it was only a paper organisation or that it had no existence outside of false or misleading Returns, but, accepting the right hon. Gentleman's most optimistic hope, and granting that every unit was in its place and full up, that it was a force composed very largely of ineffectives. Consequently the country was paying for a fighting force and did not get it.

He would endeavour to make these points good. In the first place this scheme was based mainly on the idea of an insufficient Navy, and on the expectation, or the fear, of an invasion of these islands. In the course of a previous debate the question was asked, What was the inspiration of the scheme? and the right hon. Gentleman the other day said that it was the handiwork of the old Defence Committee. That was, he thought, rather an unkind remark, seeing that that Committee had ceased to be, and the right hon Gentleman ought to have borne in mind the old kindly adage, *De mortuis nil nisi bonum.* If he might hazard a guess as to what was its inspiration, he should say it was a perusal of that well-known essay the "Battle of Dorking." It will be remembered that the field of Armageddon therein described was the right hon. Gentleman's own constituency, and that would naturally bias his judgment. Whatever the inspiration, however, he thought there was no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman's dominating idea was the fear of invasion of these islands. Consequently the well-meaning but mistaken efforts of the right hon. Gentleman to provide the country, as an alternative to an insufficient Navy, with a military force after the German pattern, whilst at the same time neglecting the real and crying needs of the Army, reminded him of the unhappy days when Charles II. and his principal advisers were "chasing poor moths" at Whitehall while the enemy's guns were thundering in the Thames. In the second place, he maintained that the Army Corps organisation was unsuited for a foreign service force, because it was too large a unit to be shipped over sea with any likelihood of preserving its corporate existence after landing at the base of operations. It would at once be split up into brigades and divisions and hurried up country. No foreign Army Corps was designed for service over seas, and for this purpose divisional organisation was much more suitable. His next and most serious objection was that it was dependent for its very existence as a fighting force, even at home, on a large influx of Reservists. That would not matter so much in dealing with the Army Corps not required for immediate service, but even the First Army Corps, which was our first and only striking force, and supposed to be always ready for over-sea service, was essentially an ineffective force—that was to say, a force composed largely of ineffectives which would have to be weeded out, and replaced by Reservists, before it could go abroad. The Secretary for War himself admitted that out of battalions of 800 men there was only an average of 500 ready to go to the front in the South African War, and even that proportion was a trifle over-estimated.

MR. BRODRICK said that the hon. Gentleman forgot that a battalion received 200 recruits each year, and that they could not count on recruits of the first year.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE said he did not think it was much to boast of that the battalions of the First Army Corps should, from whatever cause, have in their ranks 300 admittedly ineffective men. What was the result of this system of depending on the Reserve? The Reserve, instead of being a mere military force, became a great political or diplomatic factor in any *ante bellum* situation. It hampered the course of diplomacy, or might even precipitate a war, because if the Reserves were called out it was regarded as equivalent to throwing down the gauntlet; it showed our opponents that we meant to fight, and consequently diplomatic negotiations could no longer be carried on. On the other hand, if the Reserves were not called out, we could not get ready to fight in case our opponents suddenly determined to break off diplomatic relations and to attack us at the first opportunity. Even in exceptional cases, where we were fighting with only an uncivilised enemy, this dependence of the fighting units on their Reservists meant that men had to be swapped in crossing the seas, and a start made to the front with the corps entirely reconstructed, untrained, and with the bulk of the men quite unknown to their officers. Either way, the Reserve was a spoke in the wheel, and simply because it had been perverted from its proper use and, instead of being a Reserve, was made the first line. Surely it was only commonsense and an imperative necessity that the foreign service force, the first weapon of military offence, should be a force, however small, which should be always at war strength, always equipped and trained for war, composed entirely of effective men, fit to take their place in the fighting line at any moment, and that it should be entirely independent of a Reserve or of any padding from without, until, of course, actual wastage in war reduced its numbers. It might be said that this was another attack on the linked-battalion system, but he maintained that it was only another striking illustration of the fatuity of that system. He was aware that the Secretary for War derided that idea, and did not think that the depôt system produced effective Reserves. Did the right hon. Gentleman pretend that the Marines and the Guards were not efficient, and could he name any other home battalions that were?

MR. BRODRICK said that the Guards were worked on small lines, and the men went into the depôt for two or three months and then were at once posted to their battalions.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE said that was the principle which he was advocating.

MR. BRODRICK said that young men joined the depôts at eighteen years of age, but they were not sent out to India until they reached the age of twenty.

MR. ARTHUR LEE said that the right hon. Gentleman assumed that these men should be enlisted at the age of eighteen, and would only be kept at the depôt for two or three months, but in the case of the Marines they were kept for a much longer period, with great benefit to the force they ultimately joined. The question of the linked battalions was one which must be faced at some time. What did the system mean? It implied or required a fantastic theory of equilibrium between the battalions at home and abroad—a condition which did not exist, which never had existed, and never would exist. Accuracy demanded the admission that it had been demonstrated by the War Office astronomer that at a certain midnight hour during the trooping season in the late seventies, it did happen that there were, for a few moments, precisely the same number of battalions at home as abroad, but that was a mere astronomical phenomenon, like the transit of Mars, never repeated before or since. And yet successive Secretaries for War clung to the idea with the same rapt fanaticism that sustained King Arthur's Knights in their quest for the Holy Grail; and, like these knights, were ready to sacrifice everything material in order to attain the unattainable. The linked-battalion system wrecked the home battalions, made it impossible to have at command an ever-ready and effective striking force for foreign service, and made the first two years of a soldier's career so unattractive, so heart-breaking, that good men would not join the Army. What was the alternative? It was the Marine or Guards system. Instead of a hundred or so ill-found, ill-conducted, ill-famed little depôts scattered over the country, there should be a small number of large, central, well-equipped depôts, similar to those at Walmer, Eastley, or Caterham, whence it would be possible to supply all the battalions, both at home and abroad, with the whole of their recruits direct. And what would be the effect? In the first place the depôt would be an attractive and inspiring start of the young soldier's career, instead of, as at present, a discouraging and humiliating experience. He would have as his first mentors and instructors the keenest and best officers and non-commissioned officers that could be found, instead of as at present the slackest and most inefficient. The second effect would be that the home battalions, instead of being mere "turnstiles" or "squeezed lemons," would be real units, consisting largely of young soldiers perhaps, but capable of being trained effectively, and of becoming fighting machines.

What was the official obstacle to this common-sense system? Mainly that the expense of building the necessary barracks for these central depôts would be prohibitive. Why, the Secretary of War had had £6,000,000 recently to spend on new barracks, and instead of spending it in this common-sense way he had frittered it away all over the United Kingdom in order to bolster up, and to perpetuate if possible, that linked-battalion system which did not exist in practice, never had existed, and never could exist, as a working plan. His next complaint against the Secretary of State was one which the right hon. Gentleman had often heard before, though he freely granted that the right hon. Gentleman had done a great deal to meet it. He referred to the recruiting question, and more particularly to the enlisting of ineffectives. The right hon. Gentleman claimed that a much better class of recruits was now coming in, and he was supported to a limited extent in that view by the Report of the Inspector-General of Recruiting, which had just been issued. That Report struck him as being tinged with a perfunctory optimism. There was a note of forced cheerfulness running all through it. He had studied it closely, and having compared its statements with those he had collected from officers commanding regiments he could not say that he was greatly infected with its optimism. The reports which he himself had received showed that the recruits now coming in were, if anything, younger than before, but that their physique was not so good as was the case before the South African War. One commanding officer wrote—

> "There are far too many boys passed into the service who are obviously medically unfit. Within the last six months I have had quite sixty discharged within a few months of enlistment as medically unfit, and two were claimed by their fathers as being under fourteen years of age."

Another commanding officer wrote—

> "I find that out of 180 men I had recently received 105 were below standard; in other words, were 'special,' although not so described in their attestation paper."

[Mr. BRODRICK asked for the name of the officer.]

He was afraid he could not give the right hon. Gentleman the name of the officer; it would not be fair; but he could give him his word that the writer was a genuine commanding officer. In spite of those facts he believed that the right hon. Gentleman's new scheme for attracting recruits, when it came into force, would have a very good effect. He would point out that the right hon. Gentleman's scheme had had, as yet, no chance at all. It was not sufficient to offer a young man prospective advantages and ultimate increased pay. That was not sufficiently tangible to induce a rush to the ranks, and until the extra sixpence came into force, and the new scheme was better known, it would not be possible to form any just estimate of the future of recruiting under the right hon. Gentleman's scheme. It was not, however, only increased pay that was wanted.

There was another vital reform required, which cost nothing, and that was the question of character. As long as bad characters were allowed to join the Army, as long as no evidence of the respectability of an applicant was required, so long would the Army be restricted to a low class of recruit, so long would the British mother be hostile, and so long would the present appalling wastage continue. The right hon. Gentleman diverted a good deal of hostile criticism the other day by explaining that "specials" were no longer to be taken, and that characters were being demanded. He was very glad to hear that. The right hon. Gentleman's proposals in this direction were as yet in their extreme infancy, and they did not know what the result would be; but the regulations with regard to character as described by the right hon. Gentleman did not seem to him to be either thoroughgoing or likely to work in practice. However, he did not want to press that argument very far; but he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would make a real rise in the physical standard, and insist that recruits should not be enlisted under that standard. He did not wish to insist too much on the question of mere size. They had often been told that Lord Nelson, or Lord Wolseley, or Lord Roberts, would not have been admitted to the Service if the regulations with reference to size had been rigidly enforced. There was even a more striking illustration, which might be of interest to the Committee. He was informed on good authority that his noble friend the Financial Secretary to the War Office was rejected at his first application to enter the Army, on account of his extremely fragile and emaciated appearance. A wise discretion was, however, exercised, and his noble friend was passed through; and he thought the result was valuable, as proving to the House the beneficial effects of drill and good food. He did not therefore want to press the point of size, but he thought it was really of vital importance that there should be some insistence on enquiring into the character of applicants. He knew his right hon. friend was afraid of doing this, and that his military advisers were afraid of it, but the military mind was nothing if not timid, and he would ask his right hon. friend and his military advisers to take encouragement from the sister service, and particularly from the Marines. He thought the experience in the Marines was so remarkable and convincing that the House would perhaps permit him to refer to it. The facts were very significant. During the first half year of 1901, when character was not required, the wastage was fifty-seven per thousand, and during the second half year, when a character was required of all recruits, the wastage was reduced to eight per thousand. Fradulent enlistment was reduced from eighty-one per thousand in the first half year to six in the second; convictions by civil power were reduced from seven to one; discharges as "objectionable" from thirty-two to one; and desertions from thirty-one to six. He thought those figures were sufficient to prove that to require some evidence of respectability did not hamper recruiting, but that, on the contrary, it encouraged it. Why? Simply because by insisting on it they would convert the British mother, who was the arbiter of the situation, from being an enemy into being a friend and abettor.

He was sorry to have to repeat what he had said on previous occasions, but increasing experience of his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War convinced him that the only way to convince his right hon. friend and to get anything out of him was to weary him almost to death. After the little experience he had had of modern war, he was firmly of the belief that the man of good character and high intelligence was also incomparably the better fighter; but the important point he wished to make was that the effect of getting a better class of man was an almost magical cure for wastage. He did not know if the Committee were aware of the extent of this wastage. Taking an average over a great number of years he found that of every 100 men who joined the Army only forty-six passed into the Reserve; or, in other words, that in the seven years of a soldier's life 64 per cent. of the men were expended from one cause or another. One high authority had put it more forcibly, and said that during a soldier's life of seven years the equivalent, in numbers, of no less than three Army Corps were completely lost through wastage alone. He found that at least 10,000 men every year were lost to the Service, simply because they were so morally or physically deficient in the first place that they should never have been enlisted. He would further point out that there were not at any time in the ranks of the Army 25,000 men shown as "effectives" who never were, and never would be, able to take their place in the fighting line. One commanding officer whom he had consulted on the matter put it down to the incredible slackness of the medical officers. But after all the efficiency of the doctor or the recruiting officer was determined officially by the number of recruits he passed, and not by their quality. He received a letter the other day from a recruiting officer in active work, who said that—

> "It was numbers the War Office wanted, and if there was a falling off the recruiting officer was hopped on, and consequently he did not go into the question of character more than he could help."

They all knew that was true; but there was no justification for enlisting those men in the first place, or for retaining them in the Service, where they cost just as much, and even more, than real fighting men. The moral of all this was very plain. Some hon. Members, including the mover and seconder of the Amendment, contended that the Regular Army was too large. He was not prepared to dogmatise on this point, but here, at any rate, was a simple and obvious way to reduce it. The right hon. Gentleman promised a reduction four years hence; but now was the time to reduce this Vote by a number, which he put at the very lowest, of 25,000 men, who were absolutely ineffective and always would be. If his right hon. friend did that he would at one stroke relieve the taxpayer of an imposition to the extent of £1,500,000 yearly, and reduce the strength of the Army below 200,000 men, without reducing its fighting strength by one single bayonet. That was not a reform he was demanding, but the suppression of a grave scandal.

Surely they were justified in asking the Secretary of State for War to refuse to permit the enlistment of any man who was ineffective, and who would merely swell the paper strength of the Army. The strength of the Army should be regulated, if possible, by the number of effective men required, but if they could not get more than 200,000 effective fighting men, it was absolutely inexcusable to make up the balance by enlisting and paying ineffectives. But that was what the Secretary of State was doing, and what the country was paying for every year, Personally, he did not feel able to contest the question as to whether the effective part of the Regular Army was or was not too large. Previous speakers had expressed confident opinions on that point; but, personally, he felt himself bound to accept the solemn assurance of the Prime Minister, backed up as it was by all the exclusive sources of information at his command, that the safety of the Empire required that we should have 120,000 fighting men, or the equivalent of three Army Corps, within these Islands. He accepted that contention on the unique authority of the Prime Minister, though he did not think that any one could regard with equanimity the increased and ever-increasing expenditure it imposed upon the country. But if that was necessary then let the Secretary of State for War produce 120,000 effective fighting men. Let him prove to the Committee that one of the three Army Corps, at any rate, is really effective; that it is composed of effective units, and that the units are composed of effective men. Let him not palm off on the country a half-dozen of Army Corps, composed largely of ineffectives who would have to be disgorged and replaced by Reservists at the first sign of war. At any rate let the country have one effective Army Corps or some smaller expeditionary force always on a war footing, and always ready. At the present moment not one single battalion in the first Army Corps was ready to take the field. That was a parlous condition of things. What was the remedy? He had given his views, and, in conclusion, would summarise them very briefly.

In the first place let the Secretary for War retain his Army Corps organisation, by all means, for the organisation of a home defence army. That Army should be composed almost entirely of Militia and Volunteers with a proper stiffening of Regulars. Let that Army have nothing whatever to do with the expeditionary force. Secondly, let there be a striking expeditionary force for foreign service, shall, if need be, but of the highest possible temper and efficiency. Let it be a real force composed of effective fighting men and not dependent on the Reserves; thirdly, let the right hon. Gentleman abolish, root and branch, the linked-battalion system, which was the prime cause of most of the evils of our military system, and in its place adopt a system of large district depôts, and let him resolutely refuse to admit into the ranks of the Army any recruits who were morally or physically unfit. Let him regulate the fighting strength of the Army by the number of fighting men he could get, and not the amount which he wished to parade on paper. Lastly, let him expand the present intelligence and mobilisation departments into a proper and adequate general staff and thus do away with the reproach that ours was the only Army in the civilised world which was without this essential directing brain. If the right hon. Gentleman would carry out these reforms he would reap in full measure the reward to which he aspired, of being known as a great military reformer, and he would earn the gratitude of posterity, even if during his life time he was not appreciated according to his deserts.

Dr. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, West) said he did not pretend to address the Committee as an expert on this matter. He did not consider his having attended one or two of the meetings of the Service Committee, with the labours of which he greatly approved, gave him any title to speak as an expert. He approached the question from the point of view of those humble individuals the man in the street and the taxpayer. He congratulated the hon. Gentleman who had moved this reduction, because it gave an opportunity to those who looked with some suspicion upon this new movement to give expression in the Lobby to their disapproval of what was going on. The taxpayer of Great Britain was becoming greatly alarmed by this great expenditure, and wanted to know when this game of brag and these bloated armaments would come to an end. The right hon. Member for Forest of Dean had said he was not an economist in this matter, but he (Dr. Farquharson) was, for the reason that when he saw this military expenditure continually going up he also saw industrial progress sterilised and stopped. We could get no money for the industrial and commercial purposes of the country, and we saw our place in the commerce of the world being taken by countries like America, which were not struck down by such expenditure. Our Army was the most expensive in the world, if not the most efficient, but could not efficiency be obtained in a more economical and less costly manner? Speaking as a taxpayer, he expressed the opinion that no case had been made out for this new and expensive system. What special danger was there now ahead? Why should there be any hurry? We had not had an opportunity yet of learning the real lessons of the war. He thought the proper course would be to wait for the report of the Committee which was investigating this question, and when that was submitted, its recommendations should be submitted to this new Committee of National Defence of which they had heard, which should deduce reasons to show that this expenditure was necessary, and upon which they could invite the House to undertake it

When the matter was submitted to the Committee of National Defence, he would be glad to hear if this question of Army Corps had been brought before it, and if it had this Committee should be told whether they approved of this new departure which, to many hon. Members was so unpopular, and which to many admirable soldiers outside the House seemed to be unnecessary. In this country we were on these occasions subject to scares, and one or two had been trotted out, but he was rather surprised to hear the old bogie of India trotted out again. The hon. Gentleman who spoke so effectively in a former debate, the hon. Member for York, had given his experiences in India, but he (Dr. Farquharson) had also been in India, and had ridden over the Khyber Pass, and he was of opinion that anybody who had command of the hills, with modern pieces of precision could pick off a bluebottle fly even without the slightest difficulty. India knew perfectly well that we were the best rulers she could have, and if we kept on good terms with the Shah of Persia and avoided breaking up the independence of the independent tribes by foolish, costly, and unnecessary wars, we could hold India without the need of this expensive Army. The man in the street was puzzled as to the necessity of this thing, but if they went to experts they heard a different story. The Committee knew what expert evidence was; one expert said one thing and one another, but, on the whole, he was inclined to take the view of the experts in this matter, but he rather sided with the view of the naval experts.

He would like to know, first of all, whether we were to understand that these Army Corps were to be fully equipped. Of course if that were so that would bring us into active competition in a dangerous line with the military countries of Europe. If they were to be merely skeletons clothed with flesh and clothes and other adjuncts from time to time to stand the strain of actual warfare, a great deal of danger which surrounded a well-equipped Army Corps would be removed. But he was rather inclined to fall back on the old system of a supreme Navy and a small and efficient Army which could fall back on the Reserves, Militia and the Volunteers. Let the Volunteers emerge from the obscurity in which they had been held, and let them be treated as they ought to be, as a patriotic force which was the bulwark against conscription, and the members of which, at great inconvenience and some expense, undertook the defence of the country when the Army had to fight our battles beyond the seas. The obvious lessons to be drawn from this war were, first, a small Army that could be easily extended into a force of 250,000 of admirable fighting material, and then the superiority of defence over attack.

With regard to recruiting, we found in time of war we were always able to get as many recruits as we wanted. He did not take the pessimistic view of the present condition of recruiting. If these Army Corps were fully equipped he should take a pessimistic view, because we should not get the men, and there would have to be some kind of compulsory service; but the study of recruiting had convinced him that recruiting was going on very well at the present time. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had told the Committee that the recruits obtained were of an inferior standard; that was not the view of the Inspector-General of Recruiting The Inspector General was evidently a. man of ability, and his Report was the best report that he had ever seen issued. According to the Report of the Inspector-General of Recruiting, the recruits were better in physique, but not better in moral and intellectual qualities, while, notwithstanding our compulsory education, a considerable number of men joined the Colours who could neither read nor write. A very serious matter in connection with that Report was the warning given as to the physical deterioration going on throughout the country. Many more men than usual were rejected this last year, and a considerable number were sent back in the initiatory stages, their condition being so bad that the recruiting sergeants would not trouble even to send them on for medical examination. The Government had acted wisely in appointing a Committee on the physical training of the young, and every Member of the House ought to read an admirable article on the subject by the Under-Secretary for the Home Department. Too much pressure was put on the children in elementary schools; they had too much brain work and not sufficient physical training. The Inspector-General's Report did not in any way bear out the observations of the hon. Member opposite, because it was there shown that of the 64,000 men who returned to civil life last year, 7,000 had "exemplary" characters, 33,000 "very good," and 23,000 "good" and civil employment was found for 46,000. It was no doubt very important to have men of unblemished character and good education; but there was a university other than those usually referred to, viz., that of the world, in which men received a very fine training. A man did not fight the better because he had an extremely good character from his last place. Men who had lived a roving life, the ne'er-do-wells—they were not bad men—were frequently the best fighting men. Men who had been "rolling stones" experienced difficulty in getting good characters, but they often found their proper niche at last in the Army.

Another serious matter was the large number of desertions. He believed that a considerable proportion occurred in the early part of a soldier's career, and were probably due to the fact that the life was not made sufficiently attractive in its first stages. Men joined the Colours in a burst of enthusiasm, and were taken, perhaps, to a dreary hole like St. George's Barracks, with the result that the men were disgusted. There was a great deal in first impressions, and if a man was disgusted at the beginning, his ardour was sapped, and desertion was likely to ensue. Recruits should be better fed and paid. He heartily commended the right hon. Gentleman for all he had done; the soldier was no doubt better treated than formerly, but more remained to be done. He would be sorry to think that any number of good men were being lost simply because they were over-worked and disgusted in the early stages of their career.

Reference had been made to the "scandal" connected with the Army Medical Department. If there had been a scandal, it was not one of the Department's making, but was largely due to the fact that the Department was greatly undermanned. The responsibility for that rested not with the present Secretary of State, but with his predecessors, who, over and over again, were told of the insufficiency of the staff for the work they might be called upon to do. The individual doctors in the late war worked most gallantly and industriously, and in no campaign had the results of the operations, or the treatment of typhoid, been so good. At first he looked upon the new Advisory Board as likely to cause friction, as was frequently the case when civilians and military men worked together, but the right hon. Gentleman had stated, and he had also heard privately, that the Board was working very well. The Secretary of State had been fortunate in getting Sir Frederick Treves, the most brilliant surgeon in London, to give up a portion of his valuable time to the work of the Board, and it was to be hoped that it would be the means of bringing the right hon. Gentleman into touch with the medical schools, and so securing a supply of first-rate medical material. If that should happen, the name of the right hon. Gentleman would go down to posterity as having done a really good thing for the Army Medical Department. The improvement in the position of the Director-General of the Department was an admirable arrangement. The late Director-General was made a scapegoat, and retired without the honours and distinctions which had been given to all his predecessors. His successor, however, had not only more pay, but more dignity, and was Chairman of the Advisory Board, so that he was in a position of great responsibility. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman upon that result, and he hoped they would continue to have a larger flow of good candidates for the Army Medical Corps.

*LIEUT.-GENERAL LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) said the Financial Secretary, in speaking of inspection of Volunteers, stated that criticism was not necessarily condemnation, and he intended to apply this to the present debate. As regarded the Estimates for the Army, the House of Commons was really a sort of inspecting officer, and its duty was to criticise. Some branches of the Army had been most ably dealt with by previous speakers, but there were some points which had not been touched upon. Notwithstanding what had been said he could not help thinking that recruiting was at the bottom of all the difficulty in their system. A good deal had been made of the report of the Inspector General on Recruiting, but he thought it was interpreted too optimistically, but he was inclined to think that the Secretary of State for War had made a mistake, and did not present his case in the most advantageous way, and so it was thought he was asking for too many men. This large force was not asked for in order to defend these islands, but in order to supply drafts for the foreign service The recruits were mostly lads under eighteen years of age, and had to be kept at home on pay until old enough for foreign service. It would be much better to do as he had urged on another occasion, and follow the practice of the Navy, where they were first called boys, then ordinary seamen, and finally able-bodies In the Army the boys were rated as men, and foreign nations must know that they were not men, and the country was likely to be deceived by statements calling them effective men. They were not effective men, and the country should know it. Now he came to what was done with these recruits. They were put into the linked battalions until old enough for foreign service, but he did not think that was the best way to deal with them, and it was a very costly method. As long ago as 1854, in his early days in the service, they were able to take out of barracks and embark for active service 25,000 men, all serving with their battalions; but now they could not send out a single battalion as it stood without calling out the Reserves. But after those fighting units were exhausted, they had then to depend on raw recruits. They all knew that the boys sent out to the Crimea died like flies, and they did not want a repetition of that. Therefore, a Reserve was organised to take the place of the wastage of the first line, instead of which the new system was that the Reserves were placed in the first line. This was not a cheap way of training recruits, or an honest way of stating to the country what they had got.

In regard to the Reservists, they based their experience on what happened when the South African War broke out. What was the Reservist then? He had served eight-and-a-half years with the Colours, and he could not have been more than three-and-a-half years out of the Army. Under the present system, a boy of seventeen might leave the service at twenty years of age, and he might be nine years away from the Army; and when that man was called up, after being nine years in civil life, he would not be as good a soldier for immediate service as a man who had had eight years in the ranks and three years in civil life. They should not lead the country to believe that the Reservist of three years service could do what the old Reservist did. He wanted to touch on one or two other points. In regard to the training of officers, they had been told over and over again of their deficiencies, and they had been taunted with their inadaptability to circumstances, and it had been stated that the naval officers were very much better trained. Let them compare the position. Take a lad put upon the "Britannia" at twelve or thirteen years of age, and then take an Army officer who commenced his training at an age between nineteen and twenty-one. The boy learned how to adapt himself to circumstances, but in the case of the Army officer they were now going to make things worse. In order to get what was called a higher educated class, they were going to take a University candidate, who would join the service at twenty-two or twenty-three years of age, and therefore they were going to make things worse. Let them take the position of that young man when he joined after nominally having been commissioned for two years? What would be the position of the regiment if every officer decided to go to the University?

MR. BRODRICK: The University candidates would be in excess of the ordinary number.

*LIEUTENANT-GENERAL LAURIE said that would stop promotion. When they joined, the University candidates would join the men who had been doing duty all the time with the regiment, and those regimental officers who had not been to the University would not be at all pleased at being superseded by men who had been following their own studies while they had been doing the Cinderella work of the regiment, and the position created would be very unpleasant for both parties.

With regard to recruiting, it had been said that the recruits were coming in satisfactorily, but that was not the general opinion. In his view the best recruiting officer they could get was the contented private soldier who was able to say: "Boys, come and join me; this is first-rate." Men would not do that if they could not serve in regiments along with their friends. The recruit was constantly being shifted from his comrades and officers, and, consequently, he could not make his regiment his home. The secret of their success in fighting had been the *esprit de corps* of the regiment, and if they were continually shifting the recruit he would lose all interest in any particular regiment. He thought a recruit should be allowed to remain in the corps in which he enlisted, and by letting that fact be known he was sure they would get a much better class of recruit. If a man wanted to join the 25th Lancers he should not immediately afterwards be taken and put into the 15th Lancers on the plea that he had enlisted in the corps of Lancers. That was not a fair thing to the recruit, who probably joined under the impression that he would be permitted to remain in the regiment he first joined. The soldier was a cheery, light-hearted fellow, and was willing to accept the situation, but he always remembered what he called having been "done." He hoped they would try and stop the recruiting for the Army through the Militia. It was a very cruel thing to an officer who took a pride in his regiment that, as soon as ever the inspection was over and the men had passed a satisfactory muster the men should be encouraged to join the service, and the following year he should have to begin again and have an entirely fresh lot of men. It was not fair to say they were anxious to maintain that great Constitutional force the Militia when at the same time they did their best to deplete it every year by taking away practically all the efficients from it.

MR. BRODRICK: I venture to rise at this stage of the debate to make an appeal to the House that we should address ourselves as exclusively as possible to the question before us, whether the Army should be reduced by 27,000 men. Many interesting speeches have been made, and many points urged to which I should like to reply, but I propose to give them all the go-by. I have followed with the greatest care the speech of my hon. friend the Member for Fareham. He appeals for a totally different Army system on behalf of the recruits, and his demand is that we should have at least one Army Corps ready to go on foreign service without its Reservists, and thereby put ourselves in a different position from any other Army in the world. I can only say this, that in his speech and in many other speeches which we have had to-day there was the same passion and determination to do something for the Army, but there was a lack of perspective which I think prevents hon. Members seeing that while we are voting for the men and for an increase of expenditure we must not undertake schemes that would cost a large increase of the national expenditure. My hon. friend's scheme would, in every single particular, add largely to the Estimates instead of decreasing them.

I cannot discuss the system of the Army, on which I have already troubled the House at great length, but I would say a few words on the effect of this Motion, if carried, on the future of the Army. I look upon this Motion as the most serious Motion we have ever discussed in connection with the Army in my time with regard to a reduction in Committee of Supply. It has far-reaching results in case of war, and its results in case of peace would be destructive to the present system of the Army. At this moment we have in India 74,000 men and in the colonies 51,000. Taking in the South African garrison, we have 129,000 men abroad in time of peace, which have got to be kept going by drafts from this country. There are eighty-six battalions abroad. I am not going to argue the question of the linked-battalion system as against the depôt system. I hold the strongest possible view —a view in which I am supported by every military expert who has given advice to the Government for many years past—that the depôt system is more costly and less efficient than the regimental system. I can prove it by figures, and have proved it over and over again in this House; but for the purpose of my argument at this moment I will not raise the question at all. I will simply tell the House that the proposal of the hon. Member for Plymouth amounts to this: You have at this moment raised, since 1897, fourteen Line battalions, one Guard battalion, and five or part of six out of eight garrison battalions which we have been authorised by the House to raise. He proposes to reduce all the Infantry raised since 1897, and if he carries his Motion we shall have eighty-six battalions abroad and fifty-six at home. I presume that even the Member for Fareham, speaking from the point of view of economy, would hardly wish that I should still continue to deal with fifty-six at home to form a depôt also for fifty six abroad. That will leave me with a deficit of thirty. These thirty are to be filled up by making depôts here to feed them. Out of these thirty battalions—the difference between fifty-six and eighty-six—nearly three-quarters are in tropical climates. You cannot send young soldiers to tropical climates until they have had close on two years service and are twenty years of age. The depôts for these twenty-two battalions would be 400 strong. You would have to raise 8,800 men at the depôts; the other eight battalions would not be in tropical climates, but they must have depôts. That makes another 800 men. So what does it amount to? He asked us to reduce twenty-three battalions, making in all 21,600 men, and to force us, in order to maintain our troops abroad, to these depôts of 9,600 men. To gain the 21,600, the loss by substitution is 9,600. Apart from dislocating the whole Army, apart from the feeling that must be caused by doing away summarily with twenty-three battalions, he absolutely forces the Government, if he carries his Motion, to incur nearly half the expense again which he proposes by this Motion to reduce. I call upon the Committee to consider that for every pound he reduces he will cause us to spend nine or ten shillings in order to give us an inefficient and absolutely useless force of 9,600 instead of 21,600 which could be sent into the fighting lines in case of emergency.

We have heard a great deal about the panic of 1899. My hon. friend goes further back than that. He wants to go back to the measures taken by the Government, with the full consent of the House and without hostile divisions, between 1897 and 1898, when there was no question of a Boer War. What were these measures? Especially to add eighty men to each of the battalions at home, to make up the effective strength and avoid the squeezed-lemon theory—to make the *cadre* effective for mobilisation. My hon. friend, by one fell stroke, removes the whole of those eighty men from each of the home battalions. That is a part of his proposal—that you should not only knock down twenty-three battalions, but make inefficient the whole of the sixty battalions at home, and, incidentally, it is not only a question of peace, but a question of war. The system which I have urged upon the House, and which I shall continue to urge, is that we should be able to send the value of three Army Corps abroad, about 120,000 men. Out of 120,000 men you must have twenty-five Regular battalions. If the Motion of my hon. friend the Member for Plymouth is carried, instead of seventy-five battalions ready to go abroad you will have left fifty-six Line battalions and nine Guards battalions. You send every battalion you have got in England out of England. Is it really the intention of those Gentlemen who have come forward to tell me that I am only providing for a home defence force which is not needed to make it only possible for us, as in 1897, to send two Army Corps abroad? That is the result of their policy and their Motion. Those Gentlemen who are going into the Lobby to-night against us, and if they succeed will have succeeded in reducing the fighting strength abroad of this country—[cries of "No, no," and cheers]—from three Army Corps to at the outside two Army Corps and a-half. They will replace the draft system of training recruits by regiments and sending them out to regiments by a system which has been pronounced faulty by every military authority for the last twenty years, and of training them at condemned depôts. In addition to that every year they will have to replace efficient battalions at Aldershot and elsewhere by battalions which will not be efficient but will be reduced to the old number of 720—the "squeezed-lemon" number denounced by each side of the House before 1897, when at last the question was finally met by the Government without any question whatever——

Mr. GUEST (Plymouth): What I suggested was that he should reduce the number of the battalions and not the strength of the men in the battalions.

Mr. BRODRICK: I am very sorry then, for in that case the hon. Member must reduce the strength by nine more battalions. Having added to the dominion of this country a large province in South Africa, requiring a larger garrison than before 1897, and having been denounced by everybody on both sides for the weakness of our preparations before 1899, we are now to go back to a worse position than we had before. [Cries of "No, no."] I cannot congratulate this band of Gentlemen who are professing to support the Government in strengthening the Army on such a proposal. My hon. friend the Member for Whitby, in a passage which excited the sympathetic laughter of the House, and which had no other merit whatever in fact, spoke of my having organised three Army Corps equipped for anything but war.

Mr. BECKETT (Yorkshire, N.R., Whitby): Six.

Mr. BRODRICK: My hon. friend will scarcely tell me that the Amendment he is going to support to-night will equip even two Army Corps for war. On the contrary, the interpretation given to it a few moments ago by the Member for Plymouth showed that he is resolved to reduce the Army to such an extent that we should barely be able to put two Army Corps in the field. My hon. friend the Member for Whitby alluded very pointedly and in a kindly spirit to the old friendship existing between us. I remember passages of arms with him in very early days when we were both members of an Eton debating society. He even then displayed the tendency which he has now, for, having begun side by side with me on a Conservative platform, I remember that within a very few months a reaction came upon him, and he suddenly turned up as leader of the Liberal party. I have waited for eighteen years in this House to see my hon. friend obtain an opportunity which was equal to his ability, and I only regret that now this has come in his heading again a most reactionary movement in connection with the Army—I will say the hastiest and most ill-considered reaction that we have ever seen in this House after a great campaign, and one which traverses the strongest expression of national sentiment and determination in favour of strengthening the Army ever shown in this country since the days of Napoleon. We had one after the Peninsular War, after the Crimean War, and there is now one after the Boer War. I hope we may take example from the past, and I would say this, my hon. friend the Member for Oldham, who I am obliged to speak of solely from the point of view that he had delivered wilder criticisms on the Army system than any who sit beside him, talked some weeks ago about the chaos and confusion at the War Office.

Before we divide, although we have still some hours of debate, let me remind the House that this Motion—this banner under which my hon. friends are going into the Lobby, with the legend which, as in 1899, or still worse as in 1897, will cause us to reflect what was the condition of the country in March, 1900. We had then sent a large number of troops to South Africa—not half the number we had ultimately to send. At that moment there were left in this country six cavalry regiments, a brigade of Guards—four regiments; a division of infantry—eight battalions; and twenty-two batteries of artillery. The total number of organised Regular troops in this country in March, 1900, made up 17,000. The additions we have made since then have added, I think, altogether 30,000 men. My hon. friend is determined to strike off those additions. Who can say that we may never again have to fight a small nation of 70,000 or 80,000, or who can say that that will never again be experienced in the case of a great Foreign Power? I say that it almost astonishes me that I should have to get up at this box and urge the House not to go back to the position as in 1899. Do not let me be supposed to be speaking on behalf of the Army as against the Navy. I can show, and will show at the proper time, that the Navy has services performed for it on the Army Votes in the maintenance of coaling stations and of garrisons which far more than balance any imaginary surplusage which the Army is supposed to get from the Navy. In these comparisons if you strike off £3,000,000 or £4,000,000 from our side of the account and add it to that of the Navy, the result of the account comes out very different. But, of course, I fully recognise that the Navy has the first claim on the country. I urge, at all events, that I should not be supposed to be prejudiced when I ask the country not to put upon me the humiliation of standing at this box to confess that we cannot do better than we did in 1899. Before we vote I think my hon. friends should tell the House what military authorities they have behind them for the propositions which they have advanced on their sole authority. [Cries of "No."] Absolutely! [Renewed cries of "No."] Let them give us the name. *Omne ignotum pro magnifico.* It is very easy to cite military authority for saying that the Army is too large. I want to know the military man of experience and authority who will get up and say, or write and tell the country, and put his opinion against all the highest military authorities at the War Office, now and for many years past. My hon. friend, when he goes to a division, will, I suppose, have with him in the Lobby a great majority of the Opposition. Many of them protested against the expenditure on the war, and many of them have protested against what they considered to be bloated armaments. Some urged on the Government more preparation, and their vote will be less easy to explain. But they will have against them in the Lobby all the military experts who advise the Government. They will have against them the ghosts of all their own opinions given two years ago. They will have against them also, not the opinion or conviction, but what is practically the fiat of the Government as to what is the advice which has been tendered to them, and as to what force it is absolutely necessary to preserve now. I think if we are to reject authority, if we are to overturn the system which has barely got into working order, if we are asked to neglect so recent and so trying an experience as that to which we were subjected not three years ago, I think we should be taking a course which would make us the laughing-stock of foreign nations and bring upon us the censure of our own posterity.

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick): The right hon. Gentleman said in the beginning of his speech that he wished to bring the House back to keep the debate to what he considered was the real issue before it, viz.: the reduction of a certain number of men. I hold, and many others hold with me who support the Amendment, that the right hon. Gentleman does not yet understand what the real issue is. It is not the mere question of the reduction of a definite number of men, but really the question is whether the right hon. Gentleman is not asking for excessive numbers, and whether, by a mere thinking out of a policy of the needs of the country and of the Empire, we cannot get a far more effective Army with fewer numbers? That is not a narrow issue. It is the broadest possible issue of policy that can be raised, and which is intended to be raised, by the Amendment before the Committee, if I rightly understood the speeches on the other side. The right hon. Gentleman in his speech has narrowed the issue so much that he positively left the financial considerations out of account altogether.

Now, the real difference between the supporters of the Amendment and the Government is this: the supporters of the Amendment have come to the conclusion—a conclusion which all their previous speeches led up to with regard to applying the lessons of the war—that we have now to think out a fresh policy—I do not believe I ought to use the word "fresh," because it has never been done properly yet—but we have to think out the problem of what are the needs of the Empire, or how much money is to be spent, and how the money can be spent in the most effective way to meet those needs. I admire the earnestness and conviction with which the right. hon. Gentleman defended his own scheme, but he really does not seem to be conscious of the great problem lying behind, which has to be attacked and thought out. And although he alluded constantly to the opinion of his military advisers, he has not placed his case before us so as to bring the conviction to our minds that he and his military advisers have thought out the problem together. What we have from the Government is a blank statement that this scheme of numbers is what is required by the Empire, and, having made this blank statement, some of the supporters of the right hon. Gentleman believe it, because he has stated it.

The Prime Minister admitted the other day—at any rate, his speech conveyed to me the impression—that he was conscious there was a problem to be thought out. The hon. Member for Fareham alluded to the solemn and explicit statements of the Prime Minister. For myself, I do not think they were explicit, because, although they left on my mind the impression that he was conscious that the problem was a very serious and important one, they also left the impression that it has not yet been thought out by the Government. What is the policy behind this Army Scheme? We are told that we are to have a striking force of 120,000 men, but the policy is a defensive policy. Therefore it contemplates using a striking force for the purposes of defence—using their striking force in such a way that you will make it a part of a policy of defence. I believe that to be perfectly sound. Now, let us consider how far the analogy of the South African War comes in. Here the right hon. Gentleman has no right to reproach anybody who supported the Government during the war, and who called loudly for Army reform as a necessary consequence. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman yet understands the analogy of the South African War. We want to see the lessons of the war applied. Those of us who are most conscious of the want of preparation in the early stages of the war, wish to see the lessons to be derived from it applied in the future. But we do not think that the right hon. Gentleman uses the analogy fairly. I do not mean that he is making an unfair use of it in argument, but he brings in the South African War just as he might crack a whip to encourage his supporters and stimulate them by the recollection of some of our past troubles. The South African War has very useful analogies, but it is not useful in regard to numbers. It is most useful as regards training, and as to the way in which these men, after being trained, should be used in warfare. But that does not decide the question of numbers.

The South African War was, to begin with, in my opinion, a war of defence, but it became, when once started, not a war of defence, not even a war of victory, but a war of conquest and annexation. That is a most exceptional case. Where are we likely to have a war the object of which is to annex territory held by white men and to conquer a white race? The South African War so far provides an analogy for defence, but does not quite show the need for numbers. So far as it goes beyond the policy of defence, it provides an analogy that cannot possibly apply to any future incident.

The third lesson is this: What caused the need for these great numbers in South Africa was want of knowledge beforehand. The right hon. Gentleman entirely convinces me that when he is increasing the Intelligence Department he is on the pathway to reality, and making it so real and effective as to give us a guarantee that the money will be money well spent. He told us the Intelligence Department provided us with satisfactory information in regard to South Africa. I will not go into that question. I have no doubt a great deal of the information—all of it—was excellent and satisfactory, but it was not complete. I do not believe that the topography of the country had been studied as other countries were studied. I think that the want of mapping was the great want in South Africa. A letter was written some time ago, which was published in *The Times*, quoting a German officer's opinion *à propos* of our disasters. The gentleman who wrote it said—

> "A German officer has been telling one of our people here that we did not take pains enough to get hold of the topographies of the countries we have to deal with. 'We in Germany,' he said, 'are all given certain areas to study in detail. For instance, I have had to do Yorkshire; ask me any question you like about the country and I can answer you, such as how many smiths' forges there are, and how every one is situated.'"

I do not believe our Intelligence Department knew as much about the configuration of our colony of Natal as the Germans know about Yorkshire, and we had no reliable maps. I will not pursue that further, except to say that the analogy of the South African War is, first, most useful as to training, and, secondly, as to the need for knowledge and preparation, but it is not analogy as to the need for numbers.

An argument that has been used—I think it has been brought forward rather as an afterthought—is as to the Indian Frontier. The question of invasion has very much dropped out; we do not hear so much about that. I think the argument for the need of troops on the Indian Frontier has been brought in to underpin the structure of the right hon. Gentleman's Army scheme. What is the kind of calculation that has been made with regard to the Indian Frontier? Are we to have a striking force on the Indian Frontier, or are we to be on the defensive and use the striking force elsewhere? I listened to the speeches of the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean and others who have paid great attention to this question; their opinion is that a comparatively small force in addition to what already exists in India will suffice to defend the frontier, and that your striking force can be used elsewhere. Then it is not a question of placing 120,000 additional men on the Indian Frontier, and when the Prime Minister uses the Indian Frontier as an argument I wish he would go more into detail. Might we not have some idea as to how far it has been really considered by any Council of Defence? It cannot have been considered by this new Council of Defence. Was it considered by the Cabinet Committee of Defence? If it was not considered by them, why is the Army scheme which has been produced supported now by this argument of the Indian Frontier? I cannot discover from the speeches of Members of the Government that the Indian frontier question has yet been thought out. Speeches which have been made by those who support this Amendment, and the Amendment the other day, seem to me to give evidence of far more forethought and calculation than the Government themselves have evinced. The speeches of my right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean and of the hon. Member for Stepney went to show that on the Indian Frontier your policy was one of defence, that your striking force could be used elsewhere, and that, therefore, the question of requiring 120,000 men on the Indian Frontier is not one which is really a reasoned calculation on which the right hon. Gentleman's numbers could be based. The Prime Minister, when he talked of placing 120,000 men on the Indian Frontier——

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, I never said so.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I may have misunderstood him, but I understood his argument to be that in the event of India being attacked we should have to send 120,000 men and more abroad. If he says he had not the Indian Frontier in his mind as their destination, of course I accept his statement; but my point is that he contemplates sending 120,000 men and more. The weakness of that, I think, is in the word "more." If the 120,000 men were the maximum which was going to secure us once and for ever, then it is worth while considering whether that is not an object for which we should make great sacrifices, and which we should permanently maintain. But if we are to have to send an indefinite number more than 120,000, then, I ask, should we not be better off if the country had a much smaller expeditionary force always ready, as the hon. Member for Fareham desired, and a much larger, better trained, and more stimulated and encouraged force of Auxiliaries in the country, who would add to our staying power and enable us to develop our fighting power as time went on? If the Navy ensures our safety at sea, and if the defence of the Indian frontier be safe, we then could have time to develop our military power for striking purposes. If that be so, and the 120,000 is not a definite number, I think there is a *primâ facie* case, at any rate, for asking the Government to show whether the country would not be better off with a smaller expeditionary force of 80,000, or of 40,000 men if they were prompt and ready, and a much larger and better-equipped body of Auxiliaries behind them on whom we could draw afterwards. That is the argument which I wished to put to the Prime Minister the other day. Could you, under the right hon. Gentleman's scheme, send these 120,000 Regulars abroad? I must say I am puzzled about the right hon. Gentleman's mobilisation in sending these 120,000 Regulars abroad. They will go from those parts of England which I understand are most open to attack. If we were engaged in a great national struggle, it seems to me that the disposition of the right hon. Gentleman's numbers of men at home is not one which facilitates the sending abroad of 120,000 Regulars. If you are to supply the men from this country you will have to send them on a long sea voyage to India, and till the Navy has established the full command of the sea there may be some hesitation and some risks. It occurs to me to ask, would not 40,000 men nearer to India be for this purpose of the Indian Frontier worth more than 120,000 men at home—40,000 men who could be despatched at once?

On that I wish for a few moments to consider the question of keeping troops in South Africa. We are told they will cost so much more, £20 to £25 per man more; but as time goes on living will become cheaper, and that must be a diminishing expense. But this proposal is put forward as a saving on the whole Army, despite the addition to the cost per man. It appeared, first of all, I think, in *The Times* articles, and *The Times* articles concluded with estimating a saving of £7,000,000 a year on the Army as a whole. It seems to me obvious that if a part of your South African Army can be placed on the home establishment, at any rate as long as you stick to the linked battalion system, you will have a tremendous saving. If you make a battalion in South Africa a battalion on the home establishment, instead of having one battalion at home, one in South Africa, and one in India, you at once knock off two battalions; that is a saving of two men, or £120, for every £25 extra spent per man in South Africa. Supposing the General who commands in India, after reviewing the situation of his command, were to tell us that one Army Corps, trained, as well as kept, in South Africa, would be worth to India two Army Corps kept anywhere else, you have at once the possibility of a great saving and increased efficiency. The South African question is not to be dismissed as lightly as the Secretary for War imagined. He always seems to me to assume that no further training grounds are required in this country. If he requires them he will have to pay very heavily for them. But in South Africa he can have training grounds very much cheaper and very much better than he can get them here. Unless it is assumed that our training grounds in this country are complete and sufficient, in which case the lessons of the war are neglected, there is the possibility of a great saving in connection with training grounds by keeping a portion of the Army in South Africa on the home establishment. What are the drawbacks? It is said that recruits will not go. Well, you can only find that out by experience. They are going now, I understand; and I conceive that the mind of the people of this country is turning readily towards going to places where they may have opportunities. I should say that a drawback might be that after a few years of service in South Africa they might see before them opportunities which would make them tend to leave the Army rather than to go on for longer service. Did I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that he was already trying the experiment of treating certain battalions in South Africa as being on the home establishment?

Mr. BRODRICK: The right hon. Gentleman said that, and I did not dissent from it. The battalions kept in South Africa in excess of the normal garrison of 15,000 are being treated in that way.

Sir EDWARD GREY: Then all I would press on this point is that our minds should not be closed in advance, and that this question of South Africa should not be dismissed as one not worthy of consideration. If battalions are there, and recruits are going, let us at any rate bear in mind that there may be great possibilities both of economy and efficiency in this proposal of South Africa. Of course in any self-governing colony, which South Africa will become in a limited time, troops can only stay with the consent of the colony. But our experience hitherto has been that there is a great objection made whenever it is proposed to remove troops from any place where they have once been stationed. I am not thinking of troops kept as a forced garrison in South Africa, but of troops stationed there with the consent of a self-governing colony. It seems to me that the right hon. Gentleman is really labouring to establish something which it is not in the public interest that he should succeed in imposing upon us. I have referred to the possibility of saving and efficiency afforded by the South Africa proposal; but the right hon. Gentleman's scheme has committed us to a permanent expenditure in certain definite directions, which will be thrown away if a more elastic scheme turns out to be preferable in future. What I think he forgets is how this large military expenditure must react on other things. It must react eventually on the Navy, and not only on that but on everything at home, on the needs of education, grants in aid of any local service, rating reform, and all those things for which you are sure to have demands. For those you will have to be niggardly, and to plead your military expenditure as the reason. That is a real danger very much under-estimated by the hon. Baronet the Member for the College Division of Glasgow. He alone on the Ministerial Benches has spoken against this Amendment. He pleads the willingness of the people of Glasgow to pay the money asked for. But are they so attached to permanent institutions in Glasgow that they wish an income tax at 1s. 3d. or, even at 1s., to be a permanent institution? Because that is what we are coming to. It is the future that we have to look to. We must guard against the danger in future of being unprepared for any sudden crisis, and of suffering disaster.

We have argued that by a better thought-out system of Army expenditure we could better, and more cheaply, guard against that danger. But the right hon. Gentleman brings us face to face with another danger—not that of being overwhelmed in time of emergency and crisis, but of being bled to death in time of peace. If the expenditure of the country were not growing so fast as it is, if this military expenditure were not likely to lead to other services being starved, I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman's friends would have wished to disturb his scheme. Their real reason, apart from the fact that they believe it to be badly devised and inefficient from a military point of view, that makes it imperative on them to oppose the scheme, is the great expenditure of the country, and the certainty that we have now reached the point when we must distinguish between what is essential and what is not essential. There are in the right hon. Gentleman's Army schemes certain aspects which we believe to be not essential, and which, therefore, the country cannot afford. It is because we wish to distinguish between what is essential in the public interest and what is not essential, and to enable the country to provide what is essential, that we support the Amendment. We believe that the Army scheme has gone beyond the necessities of the case as to numbers, and that it is not applying the lessons of the South African war either as to training or preparation.

*SIR EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter): Sir, I desire to express my agreement with what has been said by the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down. I remember when there was a question of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War accepting the post he now occupies, and I then said to the right hon. Gentleman it would mean in my opinion three years hard labour, followed by obloquy for life. The first part of the prophecy has come true; I hope the second part will be falsified. It is because I desire to dissuade my right hon. friend from pressing this extravagant and vicious scheme that I now venture to intervene in this debate.

The debates which have taken place since the commencement of the present session on the subject of the organisation of the Army have led to such important results that I do not think that I overstate the case in asserting that the entire problem has been modified. On many points a general agreement has been established; on others it appears to me that the defence is somewhat wavering. The most important declaration is that made by the Prime Minister in this House, and by the First Lord of the Admiralty in another place, that on the citizen and on the Volunteer forces we depend for national defence, and that it is not the policy of the Government to determine the number of the Regular Army for the purpose of repelling invasion of these Islands. I submit, Sir, that both of these propositions, though I believe them to be sound, are absolutely novel. They constitute a new departure. It is true that the Prime Minister in the speech which he made on 24th February, stated that—

> "This proposition respecting the Volunteers was the very principle on which the Government had proceeded in all their reorganisations."

But, Sir, a reference to the speech of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War when introducing the Army Scheme of 1901 discloses no trace of the supposed principle on which the reorganisation is asserted to have proceeded. In that speech the right hon. Gentleman said nothing whatever from which it could be either understood or inferred that the War Office trusted to the Volunteers for the defence of these Islands. On the contrary, it is perfectly clear that he relied so far as land defence is concerned upon the Army. He said—

> "We are bound with the Army and Navy acting together to provide a proper system of home defence."

And his reference in this connection to the Volunteers was limited to priding himself that for the first time picked militia and volunteer battalions (twenty-five I think of the latter) could be ranged with Regular troops in the first line. Surely, Sir, every one must recognise that between the attitude of the Government in 1901, and the view held by them in the present year, there is a wide and fundamental difference. And, Sir, if this difference does exist, I ask whether it is conceivable that the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman, which in the opinion of competent critics only fulfils inadequately the purpose for which it was devised, should happen by an extraordinary coincidence to meet the requirements of a system of defence which was hardly thought of at the time it was elaborated, a system of defence of which the governing principle has only now received general assent. I have a great respect for the organising capacity and the industry of the right hon. Gentleman, but the achievement of devising a military scheme to fulfil unknown conditions is a feat which partakes rather of a supernatural divination than of the merely human capacity with which we all credit him. The Government seem inclined to complain that there has been a complete change in public opinion between 1901 and the present day. But surely, Sir, the change of view is not confined to the public: it has also infected His Majesty's Ministers. And if intelligent opinion in this country requires now something different from what it was supposed to require two years ago, surely it would be wiser to elaborate a plan in harmony with the new conditions rather than to force a discredited and extravagant scheme upon the country, which demands a radical and essential change. Comparing to-day with the time when the scheme was rashly introduced, is it not probable that the sober judgment of the present is sounder and more worthy of acceptance than opinions hurriedly formed, cursorily debated, hastily adopted in the midst of a grave military crisis, when the country had to concentrate its attention on the present and had little leisure to consider the future? Surely, Sir, an appeal from the mature judgment of the present time, when we have had the full benefit of our South African experience, to a judgment formed in the full stress of the storm is somewhat of a paradox, and is not in consonance with the ordinary rules of wisdom and statesmanship.

Sir, there is another point in the speech of February 24th with which I venture to trouble the House. The Prime Minister said with truth that the real question we have to ask ourselves is whether the Army which we have provided is too large or not. If it be too large, what matter whether it be arranged in Army Corps or not? I submit that the Army is not only too large, but that the Army scheme is based upon the realisation of two irreconcilable standards, upon the attainment of two incompatible ideals. In the first place, it supposes possible the maintenance by this country at the same time of a great Navy and a great Army. So far as I know, history contains no instance of a power which has been able to achieve this and which has not sunk exhausted under the effort. The country must choose between the Army and the Navy, and the service which is not selected must be organised as complementary to the other. If we endeavour to maintain both, neither will realise its full standard of strength. And, the second incompatibility which underlies the present conception of our Army organisation is the maintenance of a numerous Army based upon voluntary enlistment combined with a high individual standard in the selection of recruits. There is grave reason to fear that by increasing the annual demand for recruits above the number which the country can supply the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman has brought us into this position: that we pay considerably more for a slightly inferior article. If the organisation of the Army is to be based on a foreign model—a prospect I deplore—let us at any rate select one country and follow it. A plan which consists in organising Army Corps on the German scale, and then paying them at a quasi-American rate, may or may not lead to the temporary creation of a powerful engine of war, but it will undoubtedly lead to financial disaster.

And this brings me to the vital question; whether an equally efficient Army could be brought into existence and organisation at less cost than the House is now asked to furnish. The Prime Minister assumes that there is no accusation of extravagance outside the question of excessive numbers. Is not this an instance of the rhetorical skill which masks the weakest spots? Is it not an artistic manœuvre? If not, it is certainly a misconception. So far from agreeing with the proposition that the Army as at present organised is provided at the lowest possible cost, it is the very heart and centre of our criticism and of our contention that large sums of public money are wasted under the present scheme. The country does not receive value for its expenditure. Under a more reasonable system greater results could be obtained at less cost. The efficiency of the instrument must be measured in relation to the work which it is required to perform, and my belief is, that greater military strength both for defence and offence might be obtained from the expenditure which this House now grants the Crown, provided that the money was expended on a scheme which utilised more skilfully the military capacity of the country, its military zeal and its sense of patriotic duty. Under present arrangements we appear to derive neither relief nor advantage from our insular position.

Let us compare our military expenditure with that of foreign nations. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean pointed out very clearly that the total forces of the Empire must be included in our estimate of cost. I accept his figure of £50,000,000 as our total military expenditure, and I add the increase in this year's Estimates, making £54,000,000. How does this compare with foreign nations? The military budget of Russia amounts to £35,000,000; the military budget of Germany amounts to £33,000,000; the military budget of France amounts to £31,000,000. Have we an effective force at all comparable to that which these countries obtain for a lesser amount? Admittedly not. But I shall be told that the difference of cost is due to the existence of the voluntary system here and to the enforcement of conscription on the Continent. Yes, Sir, but does this explanation stand the test of analysis? The cost of the pay of the rank and file of our Regular Army absorbs less than 30 per cent. of the total Vote, say at the outside £15,000,000. If we allow £9,000,000 of these £15,000,000 as the extra cost of the voluntary system, certainly an excessive estimate, we are still left with a military burden of £45,000,000, or £10,000,000 more than any foreign empire. In this connection I would urgently appeal to the Government not to forget that the financial position of this country is of primary importance in estimating our military strength, and in measuring our chances in a struggle with any of the great Continental empires. It was the view of one great writer on military problems, whose loss the world has recently had to deplore, that any future contest of the first order would resolve itself into a test of financial strength and financial resistance rather than a mere question of military skill and organisation.

Sir, that view I believe to be sound, and it receives striking confirmation in our South African experience. No one who followed the war in South Africa closely will deny that the enormous sums of money which the taxpayers of this country cheerfully provided, and which the credit of this country enabled the Chancellor of the Exchequer to raise, were a determining factor in the conclusion of hostilities. I do not like to contemplate what would have been the issue had our Government found greater difficulty in raising funds. But, Sir, our financial resources are not unlimited. I will go further, and say that owing to the war, owing also to the lavish manner in which our wealth has been expended, the finances of this country have been and are severely strained. You have imposed during the war £31,000,000 of war taxation. How much of this extra burden can you afford to take off, now that the war is ended? I am convinced that if a proper provision is made for a special war sinking fund, that after allowing for the enormous increase in the Estimates of the Army and Navy, the relief to be given to the taxpayer will not exceed one-third of the amount which was imposed to meet the war expenditure.

When the war began, our credit stood far higher than that of any Continental power. Is that the case now? The margin in our favour has become dangerously small. Consols are 15 per cent. lower than they were in the five years preceding 1899. The war has been ended some nine months, and there is no recovery from the lowest level. I shall be told that this is due to the expectation of further issues. Yes, Sir, all low prices are due to the excess of the supply over the demand. The Government has wearied the investing classes of this country and has overtaxed their powers of absorption.

There are other signs with which I will not weary the House. If anyone doubts the correctness of my view of the situation let him suppose that in the present situation another war or some other cause imposed the necessity for a further appeal to public credit. What price do you suppose you would have to accept? Ask your financial advisers, and learn from their reply the extent to which the credit of this country has been affected by the strain.

This House recently received with general approval the news of the appointment of the Committee of National

Defence, and it learnt with special satisfaction that the Prime Minister would take an active personal part in the deliberations. In that satisfaction I most heartily join; but I would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to remember that he is not only President of the Committee of Defence, but that he is also the First Lord of the Treasury. Let him reflect that the wise tradition of this country makes the first Minister of the Crown peculiarly and directly responsible for the wise ordering of our finances. That is his first duty, and let him not forget that whatever success he may attain in more novel or more congenial fields they will not atone for any shortcoming in this, the central source of the abiding strength of this country.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): It is for the best that in the midst of the more or less technical discussion which has been proceeding this afternoon, the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down should have recalled us from the more confused and confusing details to those general principles which really underlie the Motion the Committee has now to consider. In my opinion this Motion is justified by the fact that the country is appalled at the extraordinary increase of expenditure for military purposes which has been going on for many years past; and I do not know any other way than this in which that increase of expenditure can be challenged. When we come to inquire what the causes of the increase are, I dare say everyone can give an account of it according to his own predisposition; but there is one account, given a year or two ago on the high authority of the Prime Minister himself, from which I venture to differ. In March, 1899, speaking in this House, the right hon. Gentleman, who had been pointing out that the Military and the Naval Estimates had both been increased said:—

> "The great augmentation of our Fleet has not been rendered necessary by the foreign policy of this Government or the Government that preceded it, but by the naval and military policy of other countries, and until the naval policy of other nations undergoes some modification I do not see how it is possible for our naval policy to undergo any modification."

In qualification, at all events, if not in contradiction, of what was then laid down by the right hon. Gentleman, I would venture to point out that the foreign policy of other nations can only be influenced and met by the foreign policy of this country, and the proper way of meeting the foreign policy of other countries is by adopting a foreign policy of our own likely to have that effect. Therefore the responsibility, whatever the right hon. Gentleman may say, lies directly upon the shoulders of the Administration of the day. It is not exclusively true in any sense that our expenditure is influenced only by the foreign policy of other countries. It can be influenced, for instance, by our own colonial policy; and we have a flagrant instance of that before our eyes in the recent South African War.

I entirely agree with what my right hon. friend the Member for Berwick said with great clearness and elaboration,—that the South African War is not any guide whatever in the question of the numbers required in the Army. It is a guide in the question of training, and in all questions affecting the art of war generally, but on the question of numbers, no; and when we are told that it is to be taken as a standard, and the Secretary of State states, as he has done tonight, that we do not know how soon we may be involved in some similar war, then I repudiate altogether the argument that we should act upon that basis, because I am not aware of any circumstances on the face of the earth which are likely to give rise to any such war as that from which we have just emerged. When we come to the organisation of the Army we are all in favour of a "striking force." That is a phrase which catches the ear, and expresses what we all desire to see maintained in this country. But it should be an effective striking force within our means and according to our requirements; and when we are told that this striking force must be raised to, and maintained at, the level of 120,000 men, or three Army Corps, for the defence of India—and that was practically the only plea urged by the Prime Minister in the previous debate—there are two observations to be made.

In the first place, that argument is inconsistent with the fact referred to by my right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean that, after all, the presence of an available force of 120,000 men in this country is not an intention, but an accident. My right hon. friend called it an accident; I would rather call it an incident. The existence of 120,000 in this country available for such a purpose is necessitated by the force which you maintain throughout the world for garrison purposes in time of peace. It is that which gives you this force of 120,000 at home. You have not, and it has never been alleged that you have, created that force for any such purpose as the re-inforcement of India.

My second observation is that every emergency has been foreseen and guarded against, so far as it can be guarded against, by the Government of India, and, let me say, has been and is being paid for by the people of India. The hon. and gallant Member for Stepney explained, with great personal knowledge and acquaintance with the facts, the position on the North-West Frontier of India; but, besides that, I can quote the very highest military authority. The Secretary of State said that when hon. Members put forward theories and used arguments in this House he wished to know whether they could quote any military authority in support of them. I can quote a military authority on this very question of the protection of the frontier of India. Sir Henry Brackenbury—and I do not know any higher authority—was a witness before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, of which Lord Welby was chairman. [An HON. MEMBER: When?] Two or three years ago. The proceedings were spread over a good deal of time. The Commission reported last year to the House. In answer to a question, Sir Henry Brackenbury says—and I would invite the somewhat close attention of the members of the Committee to this remarkable statement:

> "The strength of the Army in India is settled by the Government of India in consultation with the Secretary of State for India to meet Imperial needs."

Then, answering another question, he said:

> "The strength of the Army in India"—without any reinforcement from this country, of course—"is not only a question of Indian, but is a question of Imperial policy."

He was pressed further on the subject by the Chairman of the Commission, who asked whether he thought that, if an emergency arose, India could not rely upon England being able to send her troops. The answer was:

> "I express my own firm opinion, and that opinion may carry some weight, because I was, as I say, five and a-quarter years Head of the Intelligence Department, and five years in India as a military member of the Council, and I have seen a great deal of what has been going on in the way of confidential Papers. I feel perfectly certain in my own mind, as long at all events as the balance of power in Europe is what it is now, that if there were to be a necessity for mobilisation on the Indian northern frontier to resist the Great Power which is there, they would not at that time move a single man from England to the help of India."

Then, in a further answer, he says:

> "I am obliged to keep repeating this, that with such a balance of power as there is now in Europe and such a condition of alliances, if India were to be threatened by Russia on her northern frontier, and there were to be an imminent probability of war, this country would not send one soldier out of England."

He went on to add:

> "Neither to India nor anywhere else."

He also says:

> "I do not say that after a certain length of time, after perhaps this country had completely established her supremacy at sea, had swept the seas, if she had succeeded in doing this, and after all possible danger of attack upon this country had disappeared, I do not say that then she might not send troops out to India."

I may here interpolate that there would be abundance of time to organise if all these antecedent circumstances took place—

> "But it is a question whether it would be in time, and therefore it is knowing of this that India does keep up this great force in India."

He not only says that we should not send a man to India in case of danger to the northern frontier, but that the force now maintained in India is not maintained for mere domestic and police purposes, but is maintained for the express reason that it is considered by the military authorities in India to be adequate to the defence of the frontier.

> "For the purposes of the defence of our frontier," we are told, "we have to keep up a large field Army in addition to what might be called the obligatory garrisons of India. If you can do away with that frontier question

altogether, then you might reduce your Indian Army by—I do not wish to commit myself to any figures—but say 50,000 native troops and 20,000 British troops."

The right hon. Gentleman has asked us whether we are supported by any military authority whatever. On the question of the reinforcement of India, which is the one subject upon which the Prime Minister based the necessity of maintaining these three Army Corps, I have adduced a military authority giving an opinion of the most sweeping kind. So much for that question. Let us go back to expenditure. Is it too great? It imposes, as I hold, an undue burden upon this country both in money and in men. I think in our appreciation of the money we sometimes forget the men. As to money, I need not repeat figures that are familiar to the House. The Estimates since 1884 have been more than doubled, and as to the future the right hon. Gentleman has a convenient word, which all of us abuse—the word "normal." There is a certain expenditure which is supposed to be normal, but normal does not at any rate mean stationary, because even with regard to the right hon. Gentleman's own schemes, I think it has been abundantly shown that there are great sources of expenditure necessarily involved in the system as it now stands, which must cast a great burden upon the resources of the country in future years. In fact, within the year on which we are about to enter, I should like to know whether there is to be any Military Works Bill. By means of subsidiary and auxiliary sources of expenditure, we often incur a large expenditure not represented at all on the face of the Estimates. Let us look for a moment at the question of the men. What are we taking from the population—abstracting, that is, from the productive industry of the community? We have within the last few years doubled the *personnel* of the Navy, and then as to the recruits I do not know whether I need quote at full length what the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State said the other day. He said that our normal recruiting used to be 35,000 a year, that in 1900 it went up to 45,000, and that in 1901 it was about 46,000.

"I told the House last year," he said, "that we required 50,000, not to carry out my scheme, but to secure the number of recruits necessary to make up the numbers which Parliament voted."

Then he spoke of the extra pay which had been given to get these recruits. The original pay of 7d. had been raised to 10d., and then to 1s., and presently every soldier of two years' service would get 1s. 6d.

Mr. BRODRICK: On re-engagement.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman went on—

"Whereas in previous years we got about 35,000 recruits, and thought ourselves lucky, taking, if we went over that number, one-third as specials, last year we had the biggest recruiting we ever had. Without bounties we took nearly 51,000 recruits, of whom only 16 per cent. were specials."

That was in one sense satisfactory. It was satisfactory that the recruits had been obtained. On the other hand, it comes to this—that you base your policy on the hope of getting 15,000 recruits per annum more than you did before. You, in fact, increase your recruiting by something like 40 per cent. All this breaks down if you do not get the extra recruits, and I very much doubt whether you will get them.

Another point which I would urge upon the Committee, as I often have done before, is that, while you were taking from the country the number of recruits which we used to require, you were taking less useful, less industrious, and less hopeful members of society, and making men of them by putting them into the Army. That was much less of a drain upon the resources and productive power of the country than it will be to go into the higher ranks of the population in order to fill up your number. But if this does break down, then let the Committee consider what they have before them. There are only two alternatives. You must either alter your system, which has stood you in good stead in the emergency of the South African War, or revise and reduce your standard of requirements. I say nothing of compulsion, because the Government have rejected it, and I believe the country had rejected it. The compulsory system of service is wholly inapplicable to any army which has so large a proportion of its number serving abroad. The course I would press upon the Government is to reduce the standard of requirements. The obstacles, I admit, are enormous. I hesitate between the old man of the sea and the octopus as a figure by which to express the situation. You cannot throw it off in a hurry, and you cannot get out of its clutches. But one thing can be done, a thing which has been done in past years with great effect, you can bring home part of the foreign garrisons; that would certainly be a step in the right direction, in every respect, above all in an economical direction.

The hon. Member for Plymouth, whose speech in moving the Amendment was listened to with so much pleasure last night, made, I think, a mistake, when he spoke upon this subject, in saying that troops were brought home mainly from tropical stations They were brought home from New Zealand, from South Africa, from Canada; and these are not tropical stations. There was experience in both New Zealand and South Africa, but, apart from other questions, so long as the troops were maintained there, there were wars upon wars upon some excuse or other, and, after bringing the troops home, the policy of native warfare fell into disuse. Therefore, I say, do not let us go back upon any policy of that sort, but rather carry it further. The Estimates for recent years show that the Colonial garrisons have nearly all been increased. Year by year small additions have been made. Then there is the great question upon which I happen to differ from my right hon. friend the Member for Berwick —the question of stationing a large portion of the Army in South Africa. I attach more importance to the objections to such a proposal than my right hon. friend does. At all events, if General Brackenbury is an authority in the matter, one great reason for maintaining an Army Corps in South Africa vanishes, because you will not require to have any such force at hand for operations in India in case of necessity.

Now let me say a word or two on the very disputed point—what is known as the linked-battalion system, a misnomer, let me say at once, for linked battalions disappeared more than twenty years ago; they were two battalions which maintained their entity as separate regiments, but for the purpose of supplying drafts for foreign service they were grouped together. That system, objectionable in many ways, came to an end twenty years ago, and since then we have had double battalions of the same regiment. Now, the original scheme went much further than either the linked battalion or the double battalion; but it was impossible to carry it out owing to the pressure of local prejudice and of regimental prejudices and associations. I believe that the cure for all that is objectionable in the double-battalion system is to carry that system very much further instead of going back upon it. My right hon. friend the Member for Forest of Dean spoke of it as a fetish of some Members, and I suppose he had his eye upon me as being among those Members; but I make no fetish of the system; do away with it if you can, find something better; but it has never been fully tried yet. It has this great advantage, that it is effective for our purpose. and is the most economical arrangement we can possibly have. But I admit again that here we are tied and bound. I spoke of an octopus just now, and you have an octopus of county feeling and regimental feeling, and it is almost impossible to double up battalions in a way that it can advantageously be done. Very wisely in the last year or two the right hon. Gentleman has raised fresh battalions of existing regiments, and that is a step in the right direction, and I should be glad if it could be carried further. I cannot say what possible reductions could be made in foreign garrisons. The Secretary of State holds out the hope that in two or four years our Reserves will have attained such dimensions that a reduction will be possible. But how can it be possible if this necessary force of 120,000 men, always ready to be sent to India or anywhere else in case of emergency, is to be maintained? He bases his Estimates on this policy of 120,000 men; therefore, I venture to think he is excluded from the possibility of making the reduction himself upon the theory upon which he proceeds.

MR. BRODRICK: Pardon me; there will be more Reserves and less men with the Colours.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Yes, but I am not talking of the Reserves, but of the men to be available as a striking force. The main fact of the whole of this matter is that the country asks that this increasing expenditure should be brought to a stop. We can do no more than I have humbly attempted to do and what others have done—to indicate a line in which some relief, at all events, can be given that will lead to this result; and, as an expression of that strong feeling in the country, I shall certainly support the Amendment which has been moved.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: At an earlier period of this afternoon's debate the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean said it was easy for the Leader of the House to come in at the end of a debate and obtain a dialectical triumph by knocking together the heads of the various critics of the Government; and that is no doubt true. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down would, if I wished to indulge in such an operation, give me ample opportunity. We have had, for instance, an interesting and able speech from my hon. friend, the Member for Hampshire, with an explanation of his views upon what is called the linked-battalion system, his objections to it, and his opinion that a much better, more effective, and more economical system might be substituted; and I need hardly say that the linked battalions have no more passionate admirer in the House than the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, but who has joined with my hon. friend in his criticisms of the Government, and will join him in the Lobby against us. I might even go further and draw attention, if it were worth while to do so, to the difference in opinions expressed from that Front Bench itself in the course of this afternoon's debate, upon the expediency of keeping a large and important part of our Army in South Africa. The right hon. Baronet the Member for Berwick takes one view, the right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken takes another. But I do not care to raise this question or dwell upon these differences of opinion. I admit at once that this problem, this military problem presented by our very peculiar position, is so difficult, so complicated, that you must not expect from attackers or defenders of any system an absolute and drilled unanimity of opinion upon all the details as to how the system should be attacked or defended; and, for my part, so long as the criticisms are really for the purpose of enlightenment, I have no objection to them. I think the House would be insane if, on account of any single argument used in this debate, it should try to upset the whole system on which the Army has been administered since Mr. Cardwell's reform of 1870. If the system is to be condemned, it is only by a long, laborious, and difficult process the alteration can be made. I am not going to defend the linked-battalion system; I will only remind the Committee of what my right hon. friend has said, that, so far as he is aware, no soldier, whatever his predisposition may have been, whatever may have been his prejudices against the linked-battalion system, when he came on the Headquarters Staff, and had to examine all that was involved in a change of that system with all that could be said in favour of it, and when he had weighed one against the other—not a single individual but has come to the conclusion that, with all its defects and inconveniences that lent themselves to hostile criticism, with all its disadvantages, it was probably the best method of meeting the difficult problem of how to raise by voluntary enlistment alone an Army to be used in theatres of war that cannot be foreseen, in theatres of war where the conditions differ widely one from the other, and in military expeditions, not against enemies whose power of attack can be calculated with the nice precision with which strategists on the Continent have to frame their forecasts. All I shall do now is not to say that in my opinion the system pursued in the British Army is at the present time, or will be at any future time, of that impeccable character that sound criticism cannot be addressed against it; what I shall devote myself to is, not to consider what it may be possible to do in future years, but to consider whether in this year of grace 1903 the Army Estimates should be cut down to the extent of 27,000 men.

The question before us is, not what the Army will want five years hence, but what we ought to vote for the Army this year. It is not whether when the Reserves are filled up we can make large and important reductions; the question is, whether we can make the reduction now, and it is to this I will ask the Committee to give attention. The problem is twofold. There is the question of home defence—I mean the defence of these shores—and there is the offensive-defensive side of the problem which would be presented to us in an invasion of any part of the Empire, and especially of India, by a Power in alliance with some other naval Power. I take home defence first. We have had again reiterated this afternoon the opinion that the Government are ill-advised in acting in a hostile spirit to the Auxiliary forces —acting, that is to say, in a manner which is not calculated to turn those forces to the best account; and complaint is made that we say that there should be associated with the Auxiliary forces a certain number of highly-trained Regular troops. I think that those hon. Members who have urged this complaint against us have not really considered what they say on this point. If these Auxiliary forces are to be, in the true sense, a mobile force, they must have with them a body of field officers. Are those batteries of field artillery to be manned by Volunteers solely? [MR. LEE: "No, no!"] Some hon. friend near me says "No." Then I claim him, in spite of what has been said, as favourable to the idea of adding to and assisting the Auxiliary forces with Regular troops. My hon. friend holds that view. But there are some hon. Members who do not hold that view, and my hon. friend does not speak for everybody. A large number of hon. Members on the other side of the House do not agree with him. [OPPOSITION cries of "No, no!"] Well, I appeal to any man who has listened to this debate whether that is not the cardinal doctrine—at least, a leading feature of the attack. [Cries of "No, no!"] Of course, if it is admitted that we cannot trust the Auxiliary forces alone—is that the attitude of my hon. friend? Well, then we are agreed; but I have heard him expressly contradicted by the right hon. Baronet opposite. I observe the right hon. Baronet does not contradict that. Others have advanced the opinion that the Auxiliary forces alone would be sufficient for the defence of the country.

SIR EDWARD GREY: What I urged was that the British Army should be entirely separate, and that the Auxiliary forces should have a separate organisation altogether.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Then, if we are all agreed—if we are all in accord as to the three Army Corps—if what you want is that the Auxiliary forces should be in a great majority, and that the Regular forces should be only relatively a small portion of the total number, I do not understand what this supposed attack on the Auxiliary forces is—I do not know what we have to divide about. In providing for home defence we know that the great majority, so far as the garrisons are concerned, are composed of the Auxiliary forces. Some of the views which have been expressed can only be held by hon. Gentlemen who are absolutely ignorant of the scheme of home defence which the Government desire to make. There is nothing left of that scheme for all practical purposes if you take away the Auxiliary forces. Without the Volunteers it would be quite impossible for us to carry out the scheme in anything like its integrity. I have referred to high military authorities for the doctrine laid down, and this view is universally accepted, and now I understand that it is universally accepted here.

Now, I leave the question of home defence, and I come to the question of a military expedition leaving these shores. I thought I had made myself perfectly clear and plain when I spoke on this subject in the debate which occupied two nights on the Address; but I find that I have been greatly misunderstood in some quarters, even by as fair-minded men as the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, and the right hon. Baronet the Member for Berwick, who spoke a short time ago. They both said that the one object for which we contemplated a force of three Army Corps being sent abroad was the defence of the Indian frontier. That is not so, and if any one refers back to my speech, he will find that it is not so. The case I had in my mind, and the case that hon. Gentlemen had in their minds in dealing with this problem, is parallel with the case which presents itself to the Board of Admiralty in settling the strength of the Navy. The strength of the Navy is arranged on the idea that we may have to fight two Powers. I cannot try to draw a distinction in this matter between the Army and the Navy, for, if we have to fight two Powers with the Navy, of course the Army cannot be excluded. Let us suppose that we have to fight two Powers, and one of these Powers is able to invade us in India. Are we absoutely sure—is it wise for us to find ourselves so absolutely denuded of men for the purpose of Indian defence that we have nothing left at all for the purpose of defence elsewhere? As I have before said to the House, and as the right hon. Baronet has said to-day, the Navy by itself cannot finish a war; but it can, by a great deal of pressure, make it very inconvenient and expensive for an enemy to fight us. But so long as an enemy can keep its ships in port the Navy can hardly strike a blow—no effective blow—hardly a blow at all, upon any enemy with which we have to deal. For all that you must have some power of landing some kind of expeditionary force; and my statement, broadly speaking, is this: That if we were to find ourselves involved in any such conflict as that, we have to consider both the power of sending an expeditionary force and the necessity of providing additional troops for the defence of the North-West Frontier. These necessities may arise at the same time, and they may have to be dealt with together. If that is so far accepted let me say one word more on the question of the Indian Frontier. The right hon. Gentleman opposite has read to the Committee long extracts from the evidence of Sir Henry Brackenbury before Lord Welby's Commission. The subject of investigation at that time was Penjdeh; and it is quite clear to any one reading the evidence to which the right hon. Gentleman has called attention that Sir Henry Brackenbury had in his mind one of the great difficulties of the great problem; and that difficulty was the fact that India might require troops when it would be extremely inconvenient, on naval grounds, for us to send them. That is perfectly true. The phrase used by Sir Henry Brackenbury was—

> "The Government of the day would not move a single man from England to help India; they would not dare to do so."

But that was not military evidence at all; he refers to a great difficulty, a real difficulty to be considered with regard to the problem. Then I observe a paragraph—I have not had time to go into the evidence—in which he says that the invasion of India might require soldiers, and that he might not be able to send them. That is the point to which I have just called attention; and then Sir Henry Brackenbury says—

> "I do not think in the least that India would require them."

What he means is that in the early stages of a war with a great naval power we should not be able to send them. That is, I think, the strongest argument which has been advanced for the distribution of our troops, and which finds favour in the great military school to which, I believe, the right hon. Baronet belongs—namely, that we might get over a great deal of the difficulty by keeping an Army Corps in South Africa instead of in England.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I should like to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to question No. 14,882, where it is stated that for the defence of our Indian Frontier we have to keep up a large Army in addition to what may be called the obligatory garrisons, and that if we could do away with the frontier difficulty altogether we could greatly diminish our Army. I think this shows that the Indian Army could make ample provision for the frontier.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I can hardly agree with that—I do not follow. I am sorry the right hon. Gentleman interrupted, as I am engaged on an argument which I should like the Committee to flolow. I quite admit that one of the difficulties connected with India is the difficulty of getting assistance, getting troops from here at an early stage of the war. I quite admit that the scheme of having an Army Corps in South Africa would meet the difficulty from that point of view, for we all recognise how much easier it would be, apart from getting up the Reserves, to send a great body of troops from South Africa to India, in the face of a hostile naval Power, than it would be to carry them all the way round from these Islands to India. But that difficulty of the problem does not touch the question whether or not we require a force to be sent to India in case India should be involved in hostility with her great military neighbour. I was astonished at the lightness with which the right hon. Baronet spoke of the possibility of India requiring a single soldier more than it has at present.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: That is so long as the Russian frontier is where it is now.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Baronet there greatly simplifies the problem when he says so long as the Russian frontier stays where it is. Of course, then, Russia would not be able to march a large body of troops across Afghanistan by Quetta or down the Khyber Pass. Perfectly true; but I fear the problem of the defence of India cannot be dealt with in that simplified form. I only wish I could believe it. It is strange that the right hon. Baronet himself at one time took a wholly different view of the situation.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I said I should take exactly the same view so long as the Russian frontier stands where it does. Of course, if there were a successful campaign on the part of Russia and a new basis established, then the problem would be entirely changed. But that is a matter of time.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not know that it is very wise to go into details. Surely to suppose the partition of Afghanistan would be to present problems of far greater complexity and require this country to put forward a far greater exercise of strength than the simple question to which the right hon. Gentleman has attempted to narrow down the problem. Of course, if there is always to be a strong, and friendly, and untouched Afghanistan between us and the Russian border, I admit the difficulty of a rapid Russian advance is very great, and the number of troops which she could use in that advance would probably be not very considerable. But we may have to deal with a much more difficult state of affairs than that to which the right hon. Gentleman has pointed; and I do not think we should be wise—I am sure we should be insane—if we were to attempt to lay the flattering unction to our souls that never in defence of India should we have to send a single soldier from these shores. The right hon. Gentleman says he was always of that opinion. Perhaps he will allow me to quote an interesting and important book which he wrote two years ago, and which I do not in the least quote for the purpose of making a point against him. The right hon. Baronet concludes his chapter on the North-West Frontier with this sentence—

> "Whatever measures are taken, and whatever policy may be adopted, the fundamental conditions of the defence of India will continue to be the readiness of England to send ample reinforcements when they are needed. In other words, the peace of India depends greatly on having an efficient army at home and retaining the command of the sea."

You could not put it better. That is exactly the view which we take of the situation; and I really think that the right hon. Baronet ought to reconsider his own old views, which I am convinced are sound views, upon this very difficult question.

I only wish to make one further observation on an argument which appears to me to be in great favour on the other side of the House. They say, and say truly, or with a great deal of truth, "You talk as if you wanted exactly three Army Corps for all these purposes of sending foreign expeditions. We do not think much of your three Army Corps, because we see how you have got at them. You are obliged to have them at home to keep the balance of your foreign regiments, and having been obliged to do that because of your Army system, you say it is necessary for other reasons." That is the argument of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Northumberland, and an argument used on this side of the House. If it is any pleasure to hon. Gentlemen and right hon. Gentlemen to extract an admission from me, I am ready to admit at once that no human being can say to a regiment, or to a brigade, or to a division, what calls will be made upon the British Army in certain contingencies. As I reminded the House, the conditions we have got to meet are so complicated and so impossible to foresee, that I for one should absolutely disbelieve any War Minister who said to me that he had calculated all the contingencies that had to be met, all the difficulties which had to be surmounted, all the forces with which we might be brought into conflict, and that the result of his careful summing up of the situation was that he was confident that 120,000 men, not 121,000 or 119,000, but 120,000 men were required to meet the needs of the Empire. That is not the way in which we can reasonably and rationally approach this question. It is perfectly true that with the great body of troops we have got to keep abroad it is very convenient—I do not say it is absolutely necessary, although I might, perhaps, go that length—at all events, it is very convenient under our existing Army system to have a large body of troops at home—I do not argue whether South Africa is to be called at home or not—that is not a question I am dealing with to-day—but a large body of troops either in England or some other part of the world which for this purpose is to count as England. What we have to argue to-day is whether this is the occasion on which, with all these needs before us, we ought to upset this system on the ground that the strain on our finances is very great, which I admit that it is, and that the needs that we have to face are very small compared with the forces we provide. I believe that that is a conclusion which it would be absolute folly for this House to adopt. I have heard a number of Gentlemen speak to-day as if this was the first time that we have ever been brought face to face with the establishment of this strength, and as if in these Army Estimates for the first time they were asked to provide this large body of troops. Everybody who has looked into it knows that the great increase in our forces dates partly from the war, but largely from a time anterior to the war, and when the South African War was not even in contemplation or above the horizon. Is this, then, the time at which you are going to destroy the units which you have called into existence, to upset a system which you have elaborately created, because you think that your national needs are so small that a force of this kind is not required? I always anticipated that we should suffer from a cold fit. I always knew, and I suppose everybody knew, that the war fever would be followed by a temperature below the normal; but if we are to have a cold fit we ought to have it with more moderation, and we ought not to shiver quite so violently. Whatever may be right in a few years, it cannot be right to choose a moment when your Reserves are dangerously low—to choose that moment especially to diminish the strength of your Army. Surely that will be admitted on all hands to be insanity. Get your Reserves up—my right hon. friend says to 100,000; I prefer not to commit myself definitely to a figure—but get your Reserves up to a large figure, and then consider how far you may safely reduce the number of your units without destroying their value as units. If after having made those reductions, if after having provided this margin of safety, you then come to the conclusion that even that reduction is not enough to relieve your finances, that even with that diminution of Army expenditure the burden is still too great to be borne, then you may set to work upon the difficult and laborious task of destroying the military units which you have called into existence. But to embark on that task now, before you have filled up your Reserves, before you have seen what reductions can be made in the units after the Reserves are full, surely is a policy, not of wise economy, not of prudent statesmanship, not of men who look before and after, who think of the dangers to which this country would be subjected, but of gentlemen who are either anxious to take advantage of what they regard as a great reaction of public opinion, or of men who, always opposed to the Imperial policy which the majority in this House, and the majority of the country approve, at last see their way to getting what they want under the *ægis* of Imperialists themselves.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said if he presumed to follow his right hon. friend, it was not because he conceived himself able to instruct the Committee on this subject. They had already listened to many speakers who were very much better acquainted with the details of the matter than he could pretend to be; and he only wished to explain the vote which he thought it right to give in the forthcoming division. He wished to say, first of all, that the arguments which had been brought forward on behalf of the Government did not appear to him to be well founded or calculated to justify him in supporting them in the Division Lobby. He did not think much of the argument of authority with which the Secretary of State for War closed his speech. That was an argument which Secretaries of State always commanded; but which was never convincing except to very stupid people. A Government in a controversial difficulty always called upon, as their ultimate hope, mysterious military advisers whose advice was only known to themselves, who could not be cross-examined or tested, but who were always unanimously, effectively, and conclusively in support of the Government. Nor did he think, when the First Lord of the Treasury spoke of taking advantage of waves of public opinion, that he added either to the amenity of the discussion, or to the convincingness of the argument. In a democratic country the movements of public opinion were parts and elements of politics. Nobody knew that better than his right hon. friend, and no one understood better the value of enlightened opportunism than his right hon. friend and the Government. Therefore, he set aside that argument, as not being sufficient to induce him to support the Government on this occasion. He would rather consider the very interesting argument of strategy which his right hon. friend had just delivered. It seemed to him that the Government, and some of the speakers who had taken part in the debate, made a profound mistake in distinguishing, as though they were in separate compartments, home defence and foreign service. His right hon. friend dealt quite separately with the question of home defence; and appealed to his hon. friend the Member for Fareham to say whether some Regular troops were not required to strengthen the Volunteer and Auxiliary forces for home defence. Then his right hon. friend proceeded to consider the expeditionary force. Was it not quite obvious that they would have command of the sea, or that they would not. If they had command of the sea very completely indeed, they might send a large expeditionary force from these shores; and if they had very complete command of the sea, there would be no question of military home defence at all. They could not at the same moment be in two contradictory positions—in a position of having such command of the sea as to be able to send any number of soldiers anywhere they pleased, and of having so little command of the sea that they would not be able to protect their own shores. That seemed to be at the very root of the Government difficulty. He was unable to understand how his right hon. friend could contemplate in imagination a fleet starting from the Thames and carrying 150,000 men as an expeditionary force, and meeting off the North Foreland a French or other foreign fleet with an expeditionary force for this country. That was the only case in which he could contemplate such a state of things. They commenced with complete naval supremacy, which lasted until they had sent the expeditionary force out of the country. This was the whole case for a large military force composed of Volunteer forces.

The difference between trained and untrained men was merely a matter of training, and the Secretary of State for War had fixed six months as the extreme time required for that purpose. So that the whole question resolved itself into what would take place during the first six months of the war. Was it possible, was it conceivable, that the Navy of this country would fall so low, lower than ever they had ever fallen before in the history of this country, in less than six months, that they could not defend our shores from invasion? The whole thing was inconceivable. If they believed in the power to send an expeditionary force abroad, they must believe in the safety of this country. It appeared to him therefore that a very strong case had been made for the Amendment. The only answer to that case had been the general answer made by the hon. Member for Glasgow of the previous day—namely, that after all a big Army was better than a small Army, and that if you had these 27,000 men you would have 27,000 more than you would otherwise have, and that sooner or later they would be useful in war, sometime or other.

But there was another answer that had been overlooked, and that was the financial answer. It was not on the one hand 27,000 men, and on the other nothing; it was on the one side 27,000 men, and on the other economy in production. It was the greatest possible mistake to suggest, as his right hon. friend certainly did, that there was anything wanting in Imperialism, in the patriotic sentiment that had so long and powerfully animated the country in maintaining the importance of financial economy. He did not urge financial economy from the point of view of domestic expenditure or anything of that kind. He urged it in view of the war that was to be, if there was to be a war. The Government very properly had to consider the military measures they would take in case of a war. Had they also considered what financial measures they would take in case of a war? Taxation was now heavy. If they went to war, how were they to make it very much heavier? It already began to press on the means of production and on the resources of the country. It was not in any sense of trying to restrain the Government from holding high the honour of the country or from maintaining the rights of the country in every part of the world with a strong hand and with a proud front; but it was because he believed that a judicious economy, if it could be made without diminishing the resources of the country, was the supreme and patriotic necessity of the hour—it was in the name of the nation's power, and for the sake of its greatness and glory, that he should vote for this reduction.

Major SEELY (Isle of Wight) said: Had any reply been made to the case which had been made in favour of this Amendment he should have reconsidered the matter before voting for it. He should vote for the reduction in the firm conviction that though it reduced the establishment it would greatly add to the fighting strength of the Army. That might seem paradoxical, but if all those who were liable to go sick under the strain of a campaign were eliminated from the ranks, they would eliminate from the fighting strength not a source of strength but weakness. Many of those who went sick on active service were known from the time of their enlistment to be men who would be likely to go sick directly they undertook the arduous duties of a campaign, and a fighting force of 500 men, of whom none went sick, would be infinitely stronger than a fighting force of 1,000 men, of whom 500 went sick, because for every ten men who go sick on active service from one to five fighting men were made inefficient. Therefore not only would the country save money by this reduction, but it would make the Army more effective as a striking force. He therefore should vote for the reduction.

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said that nothing that had occurred during this debate had altered his opinion or had suggested any reason why he should support the mover or seconder of the reduction instead of voting for the moderate scheme brought into the House by the Secretary of State for War. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that in this matter he had not only to face a frontal attack but a flank attack as well. That attack had begun with the Amendment to the Address and had continued to-day. He confessed he himself viewed this course of conduct of Members sitting on this side with considerable misgiving. He had no doubt that the convictions of those who would vote for this Amendment were as honest as his own; he had an infinite admiration for the generous and cleansing fires of youth, but when, in the endeavour to cleanse the Government from the bacillus with which it was alleged to be infected, they proceeded so set fire to the House, he was reminded of the Chinaman and his efforts to procure roast beef. The course being taken by some of his hon. friends was fraught not only with discredit to themselves, but with danger to the Government they were returned to support. In his opinion, the Government were not asking for more men than were absolutely necessary. He did not believe that the country had changed its opinion on this subject since the autumn of last year. The danger to the Empire did not cease with the war in South Africa, and he intended to support the Government.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) thought that the Amendment was rather crude, though it had been moved by his hon. friends with such pain and grief. It was like some of the proposals of Joseph Hume, who occasionally brought forward proposals to reduce the Army by 10,000 men, and if that was not enough, to reduce it by 20,000 more. But hon. Members like himself, who had been in the House for fifteen years, and who had been endeavouring to screw up successive Governments to increase the numerical strength of the Army, looked upon it as rather hard that hon. Members sitting on the Government side of the House should now make an attempt to reduce it. The Leader of the Opposition in this matter was rather a prejudiced witness. At a meeting which he attended he heard the Leader of the Opposition state that the Navy was a necessity, but that the Army was an expensive luxury.

* SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I did not know that I had the privilege of being at the same public meeting with the hon. Member on any occasion, but I certainly never used any words of the purport indicated.

MAJOR RASCH said he did not mean the right hon. Gentleman. He meant the Leader of the Opposition in this particular matter. The right hon. Gentleman must be aware that he had a great many rivals in the House. He referred to the hon. Member for Whitby. The objection of his hon. friends to this Army scheme was, however, an old story repeated. In 1770, at the time of the American War, Burke and the Duke of Richmond and Gordon moved to reduce the Army, and told the old story that if the Fleet was efficient there was no use of an Army, and if it was not efficient there was no good in having an Army or a Fleet at all. He was surprised that hon. Members below the Gangway, knowing as much about soldiering as some of them did, when they knew that the Reserve had been reduced by 30,000 men should desire to reduce the Army by 27,000 men, and should not wait until the Reserve had reached its normal strength of 120,000. ["We only want to reduce the wastrels."] He understood that the bedrock of this question was the scheme propounded in *The Times*—that they should take an Army Corps from England and dump it down in South Africa, and fill up the Army Corps by overpaid and underdrilled Volunteers. To talk of South Africa as a home station was rather a Gilbert and Sullivan burlesque idea. Hon. Members might say what they liked; they might call South Africa Clapham Junction, but they did not get the recruit to believe it. If they were to recruit for the Army and to keep two-thirds of the force in the tropics they would not get the necessary men. He suggested to his hon. friends that a more excellent way could be found than by reducing the Army. Let these hon. Members move to reduce the Estimates by the cost of the Intelligence Department, the Quartermaster-General's staff, and the general staff. There was such a galaxy of talent below the Gangway that they did not want an Intelligence Department.

MR. J. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside), who spoke amid cries of "Divide," was understood to say that the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich had never put his great abilities to a more unworthy use than in his speech of that evening. He had assumed the new *role* of an economist, but his conclusions were contradicted by all the teaching of English military history. Since the great army which Wellington had laboriously created had been dissipated in 1814, our military system had never been put on a sound basis till now. He did not wish to give a silent vote, but to show that he supported the Government not from discipline but from conviction.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 154; Noes, 245. (Division List No. 22.)

AYES

Abraham, William (*Rhondda*)
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)
Allen, Chas. P. (*Glos., Stroud*)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbt. Hy.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (*Derbyshire*)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bell, Richard
Blake, Edward
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bowles, T. G. (*Lynn Regis*)
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Right Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Cecil, Lord Hugh (*Greenwich*)
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter (*Lanark*)
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cremer, William Randal
Cust, Henry John C.
Davies, Alfred (*Carmarthen*)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (*Lanark*)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Faber, George Denison (*York*)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (*Leith*
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (*St. Albans*
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (*Berwick*
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick G.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt Hon Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (*Bristl, E*
Holland, Sir William Henry
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David B. (*Swansea*)
Jones, Wm. (*Carnarvonshire*)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (*Accrington*)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Arthur, William (*Cornwall*)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Malcolm, Ian
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (*Carmarthen*)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (*Montrose*
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir C. M. (*Durham*)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (*Saffron Walden*)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R. T. (*Dumfries*)
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (*Denbighs.*)
Robertson, Edmund (*Dundee*)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbt. L. (*Cleveland*)
Samuel, S. M. (*Whitechapel*)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (*Isle of Wight*
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles E. (*Stafford*)
Shaw, Thomas (*Hawick, B.*)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (*Forfarshire*)
Smith, Samuel (*Flint*)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Strachey, Sir Edward
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (*Glam., E.*)
Thomas, David A. (*Merthyr*)
Thomas, J. A. (*Glam., Gower*)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Vincent, Sir Edgar (*Exeter*)
Wallace, Robert
Walton, J. Lawson (*Leeds, S.*)
Walton, Joseph (*Barnsley*)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Wason, E. (*Clackmannan*)
Wason, J. Cathcart (*Orkney*)
Weir, James Galloway
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (*Taunton*
Whiteley, G. (*York, W. R.*)
Whitley, J. H. (*Halifax*)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, F. W. (*Norfolk, Mid*)
Wilson, H. J. (*York, W. R.*)
Wilson, John (*Durham, Mid*)
Wilson, J. W. (*Worcester., N.*)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (*Huddersf'd*
Yerburgh, Robt. Armstrong
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Guest and Major Evans-Gordon.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Aug. Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (*Man'r*
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (*Hornsey*
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (*Leeds*
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Fras. T. (*Windsor*)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benj.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund

Mr. J. Hope.

Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (*Middx.*)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alx. H. (*Shropsh.*)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn J A (*Glasg.*)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H
Cavendish, R. F. (*N. Lancs.*)
Cavendish, V C W (*Derbysh.*)
Cecil, Evelyn (*Aston Manor*)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J A (*Worc*
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Right Hon. Jesse
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Cox, Irwin Edwd. Bainbridge
Craig,CharlesCurtis(*Antrim,S*
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, H. Shepherd (*Bolton*)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Jos. C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Ed.
Fergusson,Rt Hn.Sir J.(*Man'r*
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs,HnA.G.H(*City of Lond*
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(*Elgin & Nrn*
Gore, Hn. S. F.Ormsby- (*Linc*
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robt. Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh

Harris, Frederick Leverton
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope, J. F. (*Sheff., B'tside*)
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Jno (*Kent, Faver'hm*
Hozier, Hon. Jas. Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (*Denbigh*
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(*Salop*
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (*Glasgow*
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W.(*Evesham*
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (*Bristol, S.*
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (*Cumb. Eskdale*)
Lowther, Rt. Hon. Jas. (*Kent*)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (*Lowestoft*
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(*Portsmouth*
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (*Liverpool*)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Killop, Jas. (*Stirlingshire*)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell.RtHnSirH.E(*Wigt'n*
Maxwell,W.J.H.(*Dumfriessh.*
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, Jn.Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William
Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
Montagu, Hn.J.Scott (*Hants.*)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt.Jasper(*Shropshire*)
Morgan, D. J. (*Walthamstow*)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robt. Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(*Bute*
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (*Salisbury*)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (*Greenock*)
Remnant, Jas. Farquharson
Ridley, Hn.M.W.(*Stalybridge*
Ridley, S. F. (*Bethnal Green*)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (*Sheffield*)
Robertson, H. (*Hackney*)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W.(*Liverpool*)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Saml. Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson,Rt. Hn.Col. E. J.
Scott, Sir S. (*Marylebone, W.*)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (*Ren-*
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (*Romford*)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (*Hertford, E.*)
Smith,HC(*North'mb.Tyneside*
Smith, Jas. Parker (*Lanarks.*)
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (*Strand*)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (*W.Bromwich*)
Stanley, Hon. A. (*Ormskirk*)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (*Somerset*)
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir Jn. M.
Stock, James Henry
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (*Chichester*)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. E. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.EH(*Sheffield*
Walker, Col. William Hall
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (*Notts*)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. J. Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams,RtHnJPowell(*Birm*
Williams, Colonel R. (*Dorset*
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. S. (*York, E. R.*)
Wilson John (*Glasgow*)
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (*Yorks.*)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(*Bath*
Wortley, Rt. Hon.C.B.Stuart
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, MajorW. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Whereupon MR. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question, "That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Question, "That the number of Land Forces, not exceeding 235,761, all ranks, be maintained for the Service of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland at home and abroad, excluding His Majesty's Indian Possessions, during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1904," put accordingly and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

Committee to sit again To-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

CHARING CROSS, EUSTON, AND HAMPSTEAD RAILWAY BILL [BY ORDER].

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said his chief motive in moving that this Bill be read this day six months was that the Government had thought fit to appoint a Royal Commission to deal with the whole question of London locomotion, and that therefore this Bill should not be allowed to become law until that Royal Commission had reported. Further he submitted that the House was entitled to some definite guidance in this matter from the Departments whose duty it was to deal with the locomotion of London. If this Bill passed in its present form it would give over the greater part of London underground to a monopoly organised and controlled by the Yerkes group and would render ineffectual any plan the Royal Commission on London Locomotion might decide upon. In short, the Royal Commission would be made powerless, for London would be in the octopus clutch of one set of financiers. The Government having appointed a Royal Commission they were the parties who should put before the House the reasons why this Bill should be allowed to pass its Second Reading. Another reason why the Second Reading of the Bill should be postponed until the Royal Commission had reported upon these matters was that only last year, as the result of lengthy and grave deliberations, a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons made certain recommendations as to the housing of the working classes so far as that subject was affected by private Bills, and the House had been given to understand that those recommendations would be made the subject of legislation this session. That was itself a reason why these profit-seeking syndicates should not be allowed to put their hands on these through routes. There were a great many objections to this Bill, but the vital objection in his opinion was the fact that it asked the House to set aside one of its own Acts—the Hampstead and Edgware Tramways Act—passed in 1902, in order that the whole of the property affected by that Act should become the property of the Underground Electric Railways Company—a mere promoting syndicate, which intended to resell the railway to the public at a huge profit. It was a matter which would affect the health and industry of 6,000,000 people, and that being so, he moved that the Bill be read a second time on this day six months.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) associated himself with the observations of the hon. Member who moved the rejection of this Bill for one chief reason, which was, —the Government had before them at the commencement of this session some fifteen railway Bills dealing with tube railway developments, extensions, or with totally new schemes. These schemes were considered so serious by the Government in their relation to general and metropolitan traction and intercommunication with existing tramways, steam railways underground, and existing deep level tubes, that they had decided to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the whole subject of deep level railways. But the Government, much to the surprise of everybody, had practically in the same breath exempted from the purview of that Royal Commission, and from its comprehensive consideration, five or six railway schemes of which the subject of the present Bill was one. Why it was ever exempted he could not understand, and he could not imagine what should have weighed with the Local Government Board and the Home Office to induce those Departments to give certain Bills differential treatment, while other Bills were suspended pending the decision of this Royal Commission on Locomotion. He had not heard from the Government the reasons which induced them to waive the Royal Commission treatment in the case of these Bills, and until he had that information he should take every opportunity of supporting the rejection of all tube railway Bills. This Bill was practically a replica of a similar Bill introduced before, and he personally was not against any Bill that was brought into this House that was in keeping with some well co-ordinated scheme of railway co-operation, profitable to the promoters and beneficial to the public and the cause of London locomotion as a whole. But at the beginning of the session they were told that this was one of a series of Bills which, before they were passed, would have to be brought before the Railway Commission, which, after hearing expert evidence, would recommend that they should be passed in the general interest of London or that they should be rejected. That position had been abandoned by the Government, and these Departments had been prevailed upon to give preferential treatment to this railway, while other railways were to be excluded from that treatment. He desired to hear from the Secretary to the Board of Trade the reason for this differential treatment—why fish should be made of one and flesh of another—and he wished to know why County Councils had been refused permission to introduce a deputation for the purpose of discussing this and kindred schemes, and why the labours of the Royal Commission were to be stultified by the exemption from the purview of the Commission of the major part of the railways which it was constructed to investigate and report upon. He supported the rejection of the Bill.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. BONAR LAW, Glasgow, Blackfriars) said he could assure the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down that the Board of Trade fully realised the responsibility which rested upon their shoulders, and they had most carefully considered those Bills which had been referred to before coming to any decision upon them. This particular Bill had not been referred to the Royal Commission, because it was a mere General Powers Bill; it simply proposed to give some additional facilities for carrying out the Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway, which had already been sanctioned by Parliament.

MR. PERKS (Lincolnshire, S.) just wished to call attention to one point. It was perfectly true that certain powers were given by this Bill to the Underground Electric Company for working this line. That company operated and supplied power to one or two other electric railways, and it was essential that this Charing Cross line should be operated and supplied with power by the same company. The reason this Bill was being proceeded with was that Section 21, which provided for the amalgamation with various other lines, had been withdrawn, and it was now to be proceeded with as a General Powers Bill. It now merely authorised the purchase of additional pieces of land for the improvement of the stations of the line, and provided for the line being worked by the Electric Traction Company.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn) said his constituency had considered this Bill very carefully, and were unanimously in favour of it. It was felt that the increased facilities which this railway would give in Holborn would be a considerable step towards reducing congestion in the district. He hoped it would be allowed a second reading.

MR. CLAUDE HAY, in withdrawing his Motion, said he had attained his object, which was the withdrawal of Clause 21, and that being so he had no objection to the Second Reading. He begged leave to withdraw his Motion.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

City and South London Railway Bill [by Order].

Great Southern and Western Railway Bill [by Order.]

Read a second time, and committed.

THE REMOVAL OF ARMY OFFICERS.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) said he moved the Resolution standing in his name. It was his intention to confine his remarks to the question of principle, and his motive in bringing this Motion before the House was a twofold one. In the first place he wished to render impossible in the future this House being made the arena for the discussion of military cases, as it had been with so much frequency in the past—a practice which had increased in late years. In the second place he wished to reinstate the system of allowing officers to demand trials by Courts-martial. He thought there was no place less suited for the discussion of military cases than the House of Commons, and there was also no more detrimental method of maintaining military discipline than the discussions which had taken place in the past. Colonel Kinloch's case had been painful to every soldier, and it must be the unanimous wish of the whole Army that such cases should be dealt with by a military tribunal instead of being brought up for discussion in the House and the Press.

With regard to his second motive in bringing forward this Motion it was to reintroduce a measure which existed in the days of the Duke of Wellington, namely, trial by Courts-martial. The state of things existing at the present time constituted a grave military danger, and he might cite many cases which had been before the House of Commons In the six years he had belonged to the House there had been no less than eight or ten military cases brought forward, of which three or four had happened during the last few years. On every occasion he had protested against this practice, because he believed that this House was not a proper place for their discussion, and because he believed that all those cases would have been better decided by a military court of appeal. The principle at stake was the right of every person not to suffer in his property or character without a trial by his peers.

The first case he remembered was brought forward in the year 1896 by his hon. friend the Member for Ilkeston. It was a most painful case, which was defended by the present Secretary of State for War, in which some officers of the Auxiliary forces had been found guilty of an unspeakable offence. It was a most painful case, but there was one officer declared that he was guiltless in this matter and the War Office thought it best to hush the matter up. The result was that it was given more publicity to, by being brought before the House. He wished to put to the House the question which he put in 1896. Supposing instead of the discovery of this offence against five or six officers, the offence had been discovered against five or six private soldiers, what would have been the action of the military authorities? There was not one soldier who would deny that there would have been a Court-martial. He had yet to learn that there ought to be one law for the officer, and another for the private soldier. He wished to allude now to the cases of General Colville and General Buller. Those were both cases which would specifically have come under the terms of his Resolution, had it been adopted by the House. They were both cases under which charges would have been framed under the Army Act, and it would have been for the dignity of the country and the welfare of the Army that those cases should have been settled by a military tribunal.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): What would have been the charges?

MR. PIRIE said he thought the charges would have been those which Lord Roberts brought against General Buller as regarded the ineffectiveness of his operations around Ladysmith, and taking part in public meetings while an officer upon the active list.

LORD STANLEY: The hon. Member must have a specific charge that could have been brought against either of these officers.

MR. PIRIE said he had not gone into the details, but he felt certain that in the King's regulations there would have been no difficulty whatever in framing charges against both those officers. In any case, anything would have been better than that the cases of those two officers should have come before this House, especially when the officers concerned felt themselves aggrieved because they thought they had been condemned unheard. The case of Colonel Kinloch had already been the subject of Questions in the House, and also the subject of very unpleasant arguments both in the House and in the Press. Supposing these incidents had taken place in some obscure regiment, he ventured to say that probably nothing would have been heard of them, and that, to his mind, would have constituted almost as grave a dereliction of duty as the instances he had just given, namely, that there was one law for the officers and another for the private soldiers. He thought this House would only be doing its duty by attempting to find out the cause of the increase in the number of these cases. The increase of the number of military grievances brought forward in the House he attributed to the absence of reference to the proper military tribunal, and to a feeling of irritation and discontent at some of the chief appointments made to the Headquarters Staff. When they had a state of affairs in which the War Office was charged by a Member of this House with having a taint of leprosy hanging over all its decisions, and when they had also the outspoken criticism of two responsible Ministers of the Crown, like the President of the Board of Agriculture and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he failed altogether to understand how such charges could remain unanswered. He was inclined to think that the cases of General Buller and General Colville had something to do with the criticism which the Chancellor of the Exchequer made in regard to the War Office.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer at Bristol declared that they wanted drastic reform at the War Office, and that they would never reform the War Office or the Army until they removed all those outside influences which interfered with the management of the Army, and with selection, appointments, and promotions, for it was a system which would never be tolerated in any well-organised department of the Civil Service. The Minister for Agriculture went further than that. He wished to allude for a moment to the state of things which existed in South Africa, where these two officers were engaged, and which was originally the scene of the charges brought against them. Nothing that he could say would be so strong as what had been said by the two responsible Ministers of the Crown, to which he had already alluded, but the interests of justice were of vital importance. He contended that jealousies and divisions interfered enormously with the success of the operations in South Africa. There were various schools of officers in South Africa. There was the British school, composed of the adherents of Lord Wolseley; there was the Indian school, who were the adherents of Lord Roberts; and then there was the Egyptian school, who were the adherents of Lord Kitchener. These schools were all jealous of each other, and the failure of many of our operations in South Africa, and the responsibility for those failures, were attributable to these facts. Reality was given to these suspicions and rumours by the action of the Commander-in-Chief in regard to General Colville. That action was a direct reversal of the action of his predecessor, Lord Wolseley. He had never acquitted either General Buller or General Colville, but with these facts before them it was the bounden duty of this House to do its utmost to give those officers a fair trial, and not let them imagine that they had not had a fair opportunity of defending themselves; but they had been left to believe that they had been judged by a man who was guilty to a certain extent of having pandered to feelings which ought not to have actuated him. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"]

Mr. BRODRICK: The hon. Member has accused Lord Roberts of pandering to feelings which ought not to have actuated him. Perhaps he will kindly make good that observation, and state what he means.

Mr. PIRIE said what he meant was that, in regard to the various schools which he had referred to, the differences and jealousies between the Indian and the British schools were intensified by the fact of the reversal of the policy of the past Commander-in-Chief by the present Commander-in-Chief.

Mr. BRODRICK: I must ask the hon. Member to be a little more definite. He has made grave charges against the Commander-in-Chief, and, having made them, perhaps he will now substantiate them, and state exactly what he means. It is not sufficient to say that the present Commander-in-Chief represents one school of thought and his predecessor another. The hon. Member said that the Commander-in-Chief had pandered to feelings which ought not to have actuated him. That is a very serious charge, and I sincerely trust the hon. Member will withdraw it.

Mr. PIRIE said that if the Secretary of State for War took exception to that particular expression he would withdraw it. He had not intended to do so, but he would now substantiate as far as possible, what he had said. He wished to allude to the suspicions aroused by the unprecedented action of the present Commander-in-Chief in the House of Lords when, in the debate in which his predecessor, Lord Wolseley——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member cannot enter into a discussion upon a debate which took place in the House of Lords.

Mr. PIRIE said he was merely stating that the present Commander-in-Chief in the House of Lords had voted against the demand——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! I must remind the hon. Member that he is not in order in pursuing that subject.

Mr. PIRIE, continuing, said that in his opinion it was distinctly the function of this House to step in and declare emphatically that this state of affairs, which had been condemned by two Ministers of the Crown, should not be allowed to continue at the War Office. He regretted that the late Chancellor of the Exchequer was not in this country, in order to make good the charges he had levelled at the War Office. He wished to allude to the argument which would probably be put forward as the reason why Courts-martial were not approved of. He understood that it was considered sufficient that cases such as he had referred to should be inquired into by Courts of Inquiry. He held very strongly that Courts of Inquiry were no substitute for Courts-martial. A Court of Inquiry should be a preliminary to report confidentially as to whether a public trial should take place or not, and such inquiries were simply for examination and advice, but not for trials of a judicial character. Both the Duke of Wellington and Lord Hill protested against the secret and pernicious system of Courts of Inquiry as substitutes for Courts-martial. There was a Court of Inquiry in the case of Colonel Kinloch, and another Court of Inquiry in the Remount case. In the one case the Commander-in-Chief chose to agree with the finding, and in the other he did not. Had the Commander-in-Chief the power to order a Court of Inquiry instead of a Court-martial just as he pleased? He contended that these Courts of Inquiry were the worst enemies to military discipline. Some hon. Members, he understood, would support the Resolution if he omitted the reference to officers on half-pay. He could not do that, because he considered that the half-pay list should not be used as a form of punishment. It was not established for that purpose. When Mr. Macaulay was Secretary of State for War, and speaking with the sanction of the Duke of Wellington, he declared that no man without the sentence of a Court-martial ought to lose his commission, and that as a punishment no officer ever ought to be placed on half-pay. The number of officers in the South African war who had been placed on half-pay enormously increased the non-effective vote. If officers were found guilty of serious offences they ought to be punished, and not put on half-pay. There was one general officer connected with the operations in South Africa who had been placed on half-pay. In his view, and in fact it was common knowledge in South Africa, that general officer ought to have been tried by Court-martial. His action in the engagements round Zeerust had led to more disaster and disgrace than happened in any other part of South Africa, and still this case had been hushed up by the Government.

With regard to what was done in foreign countries, in preference to Germany he would turn to the United States, where, in 1873, the Secretary of State for War stated that placing on half-pay, as the proceeding was understood in the British Army, was wholly unknown, and that no punishment could be enforced against an officer on the recommendation of a Court of Inquiry. In France the rank of an officer was laid down as one in which he could not be deprived of his pay. Before he concluded he wished to remove a few misconceptions with regard to his Motion. He did not wish, after the new regulations which had been issued, to preclude the Commander-in-Chief from having the right of dismissal for inefficiency. The regulations now being introduced laid down hard and fast lines as to what constituted inefficiency, and there could no longer be any possibility of an officer remaining in the Army as inefficient. He contended that if the present situation was not checked it would inevitably become worse, and something would have to be done to stop this constant occurrence of cases continually being brought before Parliament if they wished to strengthen discipline in the Army Their intention was to strengthen and not to lessen discipline. A sense of responsibility would be inculcated by the fact that the officers might be called upon to sit in judgment on their peers. A healthy spirit would be inculcated in the Army which would increase the officers' sense of dignity and improve their bearing. It would be a change which would be welcomed by the whole Army. The tendency of late had been towards a descending scale of punishment, and an ascending scale of rewards. The right hon. Gentleman might say "No, look at the punishments we have inflicted on General Buller and Colonel Kinloch." He was not complaining of these punishments if the officers were guilty. But these were neither punishments nor acquittals in the proper sense, and that was what he complained of. He appealed to the House in the name of the great cause of justice to pass the Resolution he now moved—

"That an humble address be presented to His Majesty praying that where any officer is removed or retired from the Army, or placed on half-pay, for some specific act or omission concerning which a charge can be framed under the Army Act, His Majesty may be graciously pleased to direct that an option may be given to such officers of having their cases heard and adjudicated upon by court-martial."

*COLONEL WELBY (Taunton), in seconding the Resolution, assured the House that he took this course with the gravest sense of responsibility. He had not undertaken the task without the most careful consideration. It had been his good fortune to command a cavalry regiment, the name of which was known not only in Scotland, but wherever Scotsmen were to be found. He ventured, moreover, to say that the history of that regiment was known wherever the English language was spoken. Before that he was for some years in the infantry, and there lay behind him twenty-eight years of uninterrupted regimental life. He thought the House would believe him when he said that if he thought this Resolution would do anything contrary to the discipline of the Army, or would alter the powers by which the commanding officer was enabled to make his regiment efficient, nothing on this earth would have induced him to second it. But, after the gravest consideration, he ventured to say that the change which was proposed in the Resolution, which might have been advisable in past years, had become, under the altered conditions of our Army, an absolute necessity. He would try to prove this, and to state by what processes of reasoning he had arrived at this conclusion. The exact purpose of the Resolution was to put the safeguard of a court-martial between an officer who had committed an offence, as to which a charge could be framed under the Mutiny Act, and the prerogative of judgment. What they asked for officers was simply what was already in force for non-commissioned officers and men. If a man's pay was affected by the decision of a commanding officer, or if he was awarded one day's imprisonment, he had the right to appeal to a court-martial against the sentence passed by the commanding officer. This prerogative of judgment was one which was not prized by the Crown. The Secretary of State for War on 1st June, 1874, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, said—

> "The prerogative in question was one the Crown by no means sought to exercise. Whenever exercised it was one which was, so to say, forced upon the Crown, and not made willingly available."

The prerogative dear to the heart of the Sovereign was the prerogative of mercy, and that was untouched by this Resolution. It was not intended to interfere with the right of placing officers on half-pay when establishments were reduced, as that was done by order of Parliament; nor with the power of putting an officer on half pay, or retiring him from the service in the case of professional inefficiency. That, he ventured to say, was not the exercise of prerogative. It was a power which was exercised in every great industry in the country. If there was not vested in a board of management the power to remove those employees who were inefficient or incapable of doing their work that business would go down and would probably fail, and what was true in the ordinary business of the country was still more true with regard to the Army, because inefficiency on the part of an officer did not merely mean loss of money to a business, but it might be risk and endangerment of the lives of hundreds of others under his command. It was their intention by the Resolution to strengthen this power to remove the professionally incompetent officer. He knew that it was often argued that if they were not able to get rid of an officer on some side issue, they might not get rid of him at all, He had heard of many such cases, but wherever he had been able to investigate them he found that if only the authorities had been stricter in the early days of the officer, they would have been able to put him in the right way, or to frame a charge against him, but it was unfortunately a part of our system that the higher authorities did not know the professional capacities of those under them. What the right hon. Gentleman proposed two nights ago would go a long way towards remedying this defect if only it was carried out in the spirit, and not simply in the letter of the law, which was too much the custom with Army regulations. What the right hon. Gentleman announced would remove one of the great difficulties with regard to this Resolution, because, in future, the authorities would know what were the real professional capacities of the officers, and therefore they would be able to say firmly and directly that an officer was retired for professional incapacity. That was what they wanted to see. He believed that if they could investigate numbers of those cases, it would be found that the officer who had been retired was really professionally incapable, that the authorities stored up that fact against him, and that, owing to the weakness of our system, it was only when they got the chance of some side issue that they removed or retired him. Although Courts-martial might not have all the nicety of procedure to be found in a civil court, he ventured to say that their sentences were characterised by justice and equity, and had the absolute confidence of the officers of the Army. It should be remembered that when a court-martial had sentenced a prisoner, there still remained the prerogative of mercy with the Crown. The Crown had to confirm and could quash or mitigate the sentence, or there might be an entire pardon of the offender. The hon. and gallant Member traced the history of the prerogative of judgment. He said our standing Army had had three phases in its existence. In the first phase, it was merely a royal guard paid and equipped by the Sovereign, but too often provisioned at the expense of the people by the soldiers being billeted on them. This was under the later Stuart kings. At the Revolution of 1688, and under the settlement that followed, the Army became a Constitutional one. Parliament took over the pay, provision, and equipment of the Army, but at the same time it left in the hands of the Sovereign this prerogative. The reason was not clear why the Army was not treated in the same way as the Navy at that time. Parliament took over the Navy in its entirety. He believed that was one of the reasons why they never heard of naval cases in this House. The probability was that the difference with regard to the Army came from the fact that King William III. was not only the nominal Commander-in-Chief, but the actual head of the Army, and therefore it was natural that the whole of the power should be left in his hands. That power was greatly abused under his successors, and military commands became political rewards. Anybody who had read the history of the eighteenth century knew how absolutely true that was. He thought himself that if they were living in that time, the vote which he ventured to give this evening against the Government might have lost him the pension which he had earned by twenty-eight years service in the Army. Happily the Reform Act had changed all that. They were simply responsible to their constituencies. After the great struggle with Napoleon there were many removals and retirements partly arising from some having become officers, who in peace time proved unsuitable, partly from the great humanity shown by officers at Waterloo in accompanying wounded officers from the field and not returning; later in the century some were removed for political reasons, but most really for inefficiency. In every case where these officers were removed or retired there was a centre of discontent formed, either in the regiment in which they were, or in the homes to which they returned. During the whole of this time it was almost entirely the professional officers who were removed by this process, and the feeling of the Army and public opinion was that if an officer took a commission and adopted the Army as a profession, he thereby submitted himself, not only to the regulations when he joined, but undertook to obey the regulations which would afterwards be issued, and must abide by the consequences. But a change came over the Army in 1859, when the Volunteer movement was initiated. He knew it was often said that the Militia was a voluntary force, but when they were placed under the Ballot Act in the middle of the eighteenth century they became in theory a compulsory force. That national force was happily a strong and vigorous child, for it had the life-blood of public opinion coursing in its veins. The War Office was not an altogether kindly and lenient nursing mother. It was too often a somewhat harsh and unsympathetic stepmother. The child grew, but did not come to maturity till the South African War, when we found ourselves face to face with a new condition of warfare. We required far more men than the Regular troops could furnish, with the result that there was a call to arms, nobly responded to not only in the United Kingdom, but throughout our colonies and dependencies. It seemed to him that we look forward to the defence of the Empire more and more by our citizen soldiers. The difference between a professional and a citizen officer is that the former by habit and surroundings becomes a soldier first, a citizen afterwards; the latter remains a citizen first, and it is necessary to think whether those officers would sooner entrust themselves to, and be at the mercy of a court-martial than of the Commander-in-Chief, or the Secretary of State for War, for this is what this prerogative of judgment amounts to. The Commander-in-Chief of the future might be as great, as distinguished, as the noble Earl who is in command at the present time, but he might be utterly wanting in that sympathy with the Auxiliary forces which Lord Roberts constantly showed. The Secretary of State for War under our system was bound to be a Party man. He was, in all human probability, seldom likely to be a soldier. He would be a civilian, a man who had never learned the real feeling of the Army, or breathed the atmosphere in which officers lived. He looked upon the Army from the Olympian heights of the War Office, or perhaps through the spectacles of the General staff, who too often knew little of regimental life. The citizen officer who went forth to fight for his country would infinitely prefer, instead of being at the mercy of these two great officials, however well-intentioned they may be, to be at the mercy of his fellow-officers and be subject to a Court-martial. One of the great foundation stones of our individual liberty embodied in the Magna Charta, and rehearsed in the first Mutiny Act of 1689, was, that no man should suffer injury in life or limb save by the judgment of his peers, and in accordance with the known laws of the realm. He asked the House to remember that an officer who went on active service placed his life and limb at the service of his country, but there was something far more dear to him than either life or limb, and that was his character and reputation. Therefore he most earnestly urged the House, under the changing conditions of our Army, and the fact that we were going to look mainly to our citizen soldiers to defend us in the future—not because it coincided with his own belief or conclusion, but in the very best interests of the country—to expand that foundation principle of our liberties, and say that no officer should suffer injury in character or reputation save by the judgment of his peers, and in accordance with the known laws of the realm. He begged to second the Resolution.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, praying that where any officer is removed or retired from the Army, or placed on half-pay, for some specific act or omission concerning which a charge can be framed under the Army Act, His Majesty may be graciously pleased to direct that an option may be given to such officers of having their cases heard and adjudicated upon by Court-martial."—(*Mr. Pirie.*)

*MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT (Cheshire, Macclesfield): I intend to vote in support of the Resolution, and my reason for doing so must be somewhat identical with that which, I am sure, actuated the right hon. Gentleman, the Secretary of State for War, when he interrupted the hon. Member who moved the Resolution by stating that that hon. Member was wrong in bringing a charge against Lord Roberts without being able to prove it conclusively at the moment. My own feeling most strongly is that every officer, every man, against whom a charge of any sort or kind is brought, should have that charge proved conclusively against him. That is a principle of bare justice, and it is the principle of justice which I urge to-night. I do not question the right of the Commander-in-Chief, or the Secretary of State for War, to remove an officer from his command, but I do insist on the right of this House to criticise the manner in which it is done. I do not wish to infringe on the authority of the Secretary of State, or that of the Commander-in-Chief, but I do demand that that authority shall be exercised in accordance with the canons of justice. There is a passage on the title page of Clode's well-known work on Military and Martial Law, quoted from "The Art of War," by Louis de Gáza—

> "Justice ought to bear rule everywhere, and especially in armies; it is the only means to settle order there, and there it ought to be executed with as much exactness as in the best governed cities in the kingdom, if it be intended that the soldiers should be kept in their duty and obedience."

Cases have been cited this evening, and I could cite more, of many officers who, at the present moment, are smarting under a sense of injustice by reason of the methods and the manners in which adverse decisions have been formed to their prejudice and to their material loss. There is a widespread feeling of sympathy with these officers, largely begotten, perhaps, of apprehension lest such methods should be employed towards others, and similar injury inflicted. Hence, I believe there is throughout the service a very general demand that an officer against whom any charge is made involving his discredit, his disgrace, or his material loss, should have an opportunity of receiving that complete justice which he knows he will receive by trial by court-martial, but which is not, and cannot be secured to him by the exercise of arbitrary authority.

I will quote one case as illustrating the unsatisfactory methods by which officers may be, and have been, deprived of their good name, their good fame, and their means of livelihood.

That is the case of Colonel Burroughs, who served for twenty-seven years in the South Lancashire Regiment with credit and distinction. He was an officer of the highest character and military reputation, as is proved by the fact that he was selected to command the West African Regiment in the late Ashantee Campaign; and he justified his selection by his good services under General Wilcocks, during the march to Kumassi, and was repeatedly mentioned in despatches and rewarded for his services by promotion. It appears that the West African troops under his command believed that they had been promised that on their arrival at Kumassi they would be able to return to their homes and their wives. Accordingly there was very great indignation among the troops when they were kept at Kumassi for eight or ten months after the cessation of hostilities. Finally, they started to march back again to Cape Coast Castle. That is a very serious and gross act of mutiny, and if Colonel Burroughs had contributed to it in any way he deserved punishment. Surely if ever there was a case which should have been tried by Court-martial it was that of Colonel Burroughs. Why was that not done? Because the authorities at the War Office preferred a secret inquiry to an open and public inquiry, a trial by Court-martial. Colonel Burroughs was not present during that secret inquiry, he was not called to give evidence, but he was informed that there was nothing in the evidence to show that he was in any way responsible for the mutiny. Nevertheless Lord Roberts, from the War Office, ordered that Colonel Burroughs should be deprived of his command, and sent home on half-pay. He has thus had cast upon him a stigma, and has suffered material loss in the shape of pay and pension which may be reckoned at many hundreds of pounds. For my own part, I do not express any opinion whatever as to whether or not Colonel Burroughs was to blame in the matter, or contributed in any way to the mutiny. The noble Lord asked under what rule an officer under these circumstances could be charged; but surely there was no difficulty in framing an indictment against any officer in the Army. I refer the noble Lord to Section 40 of the Army Act, where it is laid down that "where any officer is guilty of any act, conduct, disorder, or neglect of duty, to the prejudice of good order and military discipline, he shall, on conviction by Court-martial, be liable to be cashiered, or suffer less penalty as herein enacted." Why was this officer not tried by Court-martial? When Colonel Burroughs came home, he asked to see the evidence taken at the Court of Inquiry and the report of that Court, but he was not allowed to do so. In reply to every request he was told that the case had been heard, and was closed. In my humble judgment this method of condemning a man unheard, and without letting him know what is the charge against him, and of imposing a sentence involving disgrace as well as very heavy material loss, is contrary to the idea of elementary justice. It is un-English because it is unfair, and savours too much of the methods of the Star Chamber.

I hope that this House will to-night say that conduct or misconduct, action or inaction, commission or non-commission, ought to be made, and could be made, the subject of a definite charge, and to be fit for trial by Court-martial, otherwise these penalties are wholly disproportionate.

There is one other case to which I must briefly refer—viz., that of Colonel Kinloch, which is illustrative of the methods which I bring to the notice of the House. As to the merits of the case I say nothing. I beg hon. Members to keep their minds free from the manner in which the irregularities of which complaints have been made were committed. I will say, however, that for my own part I will never condone one of them. We have been told by the Secretary of State for War that Colonel Kinloch has served for twenty-six years with credit at home and distinction abroad. He is an officer who has loved his profession every day of his service, and we have not so many officers who love their profession that we can afford to throw them away. Colonel Kinloch lived and laboured for his battalion, and I am sure that when that battalion was handed over by him to his successor it was perhaps the finest battalion in His Majesty's Service. What are the circumstances which led to his loss to the

Service? We are told that a complaint was made on 12th December last to Lord Roberts by the relations of some young officers in the Brigade of Guards, and it so happened that these were titled relations. It accidentally transpired that they carried their complaint to the private residence of the Commander-in-Chief, and there, unfortunately, the Commander-in-Chief received them. I think I am justified in saying "unfortunately," because what has been the consequence? There has been an unseemly wrangle and indecent conflict of statement as to what occurred. There would have been no conflict of statement if the Commander-in-Chief had declined absolutely to receive these noblemen, or to listen to them, except officially and in official surroundings, where a proper official record could be kept of who came, when they came, what was said, and everything that occurred. However, under these circumstances a complaint was made, and that it must have affected Colonel Kinloch is perfectly clear, because following a Court of Inquiry he was placed on half-pay. Colonel Kinloch was not present during the Court of Inquiry. He was the first witness called, and he gave his evidence, but he had no opportunity of hearing the statements made by anybody else. It is absurd to say that these statements were evidence, because they were unsworn and not sifted by cross-examination. Colonel Kinloch had, moreover, no opportunity of calling any evidence in his own defence. I think I may say that the report of the Court of Inquiry was not unfavourable to Colonel Kinloch, but nevertheless he was informed by the Commander-in-Chief that he was to be deprived of his command. It is true, as the Secretary of War stated, that Colonel Kinloch saw the Commander-in-Chief afterwards. I beg the House to note particularly the dates, as they are very important. On 27th December sentence was passed on Colonel Kinloch. On 29th December, Colonel Kinloch asked to be allowed to see the evidence, and make a statement. On 3rd January he was told that he might see the evidence, but could not make a statement, because the decision already arrived at was final. On 12th January, he was brought before the Commander-in-Chief and asked if he had anything to say. Is not that rather like hanging a man and, after he is a corpse, asking him to make a statement to show cause why he should not be executed? I do not ask the House to pass any opinion whatever upon the merits of the question, but I ask hon. Members not to lend any countenance to this manner of constituting the travesty of a trial of justice. I say that the Commander-in-Chief has acted not in consequence of, but in spite of, the report of the Court of Inquiry. In fact, these Courts of Inquiry have become mere traps for the unwary.

One other point I should like to mention. I know that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, and so apparently does his Under-Secretary, attaches great importance to the assertion that Colonel Kinloch was condemned in respect of the evidence which he himself gave before the Court of Inquiry. I absolutely deny that there is anything in Colonel Kinloch's statement to justify the decision arrived at, but that is merely an expression of my own opinion. What I do attach importance to is that I question whether, in taking that action at all, the Commander-in-Chief has not acted illegally under the rules of procedure which govern Courts of Inquiry, which rules have the force of law. These rules were amended by the Secretary of State for War himself. Rule 124 was the subject of discussion in this House in 1901 on the Annual Army Bill. My hon. and gallant friend who seconded the Resolution will remember it because it was largely owing to his appeal and the somewhat pungent criticism of the hon. and learned Member for Louth that the Secretary of State for War undertook to amend this rule. I acknowledge that the amended rule removes the injustice complained of, and brings the proceedings of Courts of Inquiry into line with the idea of justice. But I believe the right hon. Gentleman's efforts in this direction have been nullified by the fact that the Commander-in-Chief was either ignorant of the change in the rule, or ignored it. I draw attention to Sub-section (2) which states that:

> "The proceedings of a Court of Inquiry, or any confession, statement, or answer to a question made or given at a Court of Inquiry,

shall not be admissible in evidence against an officer or soldier."

That is the right hon. Gentleman's own rule, and in defiance of that rule we are told that Colonel Kinloch was condemned upon his own statement. Then Subsection (K) reads as follows:

> "The whole of the proceedings of a Court of Inquiry will be forwarded by the President to the officer who assembled the Court."

But until that rule was amended by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, it contained these words:

> "And that commanding officer will, on his own responsibility, form such opinion as he thinks just."

These are the words which the right hon. Gentleman struck out. What object had he in so doing? I suggest that his object and intention was to prevent the Commander-in-Chief from doing that which precisely the Commander-in-Chief has done, viz., from convicting an officer on evidence given before a Court of Inquiry without affording him an opportunity of stating his case. I see it said in regard to the general question that there are two general objections to the Motion before the House. First of all matters of military discipline must be left entirely with the Commander-in-Chief, and secondly the Commander-in-Chief must excercise his discretion, from which there can be no appeal. I will say a few words on these two points.

I have myself—although I only claim to be a civilian Member of this House, served in the field under military discipline, and I have been responsible for the maintenance of military discipline among large bodies of troops—cavalry, infantry and artillery. I am therefore not likely to make light of discipline. But I say here to-day, and I declare it solemnly, that there is no discipline which is not founded on justice. There can be no sanction for the exercise of authority unless that authority is exercised in accordance with the fundamental elementary principles of fair dealing and just treatment as well as impartial judgment. I ask the House whether in this case these considerations have had fair-play? With respect to this question it is said that the Commander-in-Chief must exercise discretion, from which there can be no appeal. What do we mean by discretion? I deny that there is such a thing as unlimited discretion, and I deny that the highest in the land has a discretion which is unfettered and which can be exercised capriciously or arbitrarily. Such a discretion has never been granted under our Constitution to any individual in any walk of life, or in any Department of Government, or to any Administration. This House controls the very existence of the Army, and it will not hesitate to use that power even to the extent of calling in question the sacred authority of the Commander-in-Chief if it can be shown that that authority has been exercised otherwise than in accordance with the elementary principles of truth, justice and honour. What is discretion? It is not an arbitrary or capricious exercise of the power by an individual. Is it suggested that the Commander-in-Chief has power to remove an officer on the very day of his appointment without giving reasons for the action, that he may remove one officer and appoint another to gratify personal spite or satisfy personal feeling? I am sure that is not so. The discretion of the Commander-in-Chief in determining the fate of officers under his command must be exercised judicially and impartially and in accordance with the circumstances of every case, and those circumstances must be determined after full, fair and impartial investigation in accordance with the rules, not only of the service, but of those which guide the action of all just, judicial impartial men. Can it be suggested that the Commander-in-Chief has discreetly and judicially exercised his discretion when judgment has been pronounced condemnatory of an individual without his being charged, without his being tried before the sentence is executed and when the reasons for the sentence are withdrawn, although the sentence is obstinately maintained. I will read one extract from a speech made just 100 years ago by the then Bishop of St Asaph:

> "What is the security for the proper conduct of any public men in the exercise of any discretional powers with which they may be invested? What is the security for a judge's just exercise of his discretional powers? The security is this and nothing else, that the judge is a public man in a great and

conspicuous situation, and that nothing that he does is done in a corner. My Lords, that is the security you have for the discretion of a judge."

In deciding the fate of officers the Commander-in-Chief is not a general in the field. He is the judge exercising enormous judicial authority, and nothing that he does ought to be done in a corner. I apologise to the House for having occupied so much time. I have endeavoured to confine myself to general objects, and to restrict myself to the use of temperate language, although I am dealing with a matter about which I do not pretend that I do not feel keenly. I hope I shall not be told that so popular a Commander-in-Chief ought not to have his actions criticised, or that so distinguished an officer can do no wrong. The officers who complain of having been condemned unheard have enjoyed popularity with their comrades, they have served with distinction, and their honour and military reputations are not less dear to them than the honour and military reputation of the Commander-in-Chief. This assembly, in which I have had the honour of sitting nearly twenty years, is always generous and always desirous to be just. I do not believe the House will ever draw a distinction between persons. These Courts of Inquiry, employed as they have been, must go. In former times commissions were lost by reason of the political opinions of their holders. Those times are happily gone, and we must be careful that officers, especially those who have been rewarded by their Sovereign for their services, are not penalised by reason of social and secret influences. Wrong has been done because a wrong method has been employed, and it is the duty of the responsible Minister of the Crown to secure that, in the case of every officer wearing the King's uniform, justice full and complete shall be done.

Mr. BRODRICK: The hon. Member who has introduced this Motion, and placed the notice on the Paper, has raised a most important question relating to the discipline of the Army; and I certainly hoped to hear that his treatment of the matter, and the Members who might follow him, would be of the nature of an impersonal statement of general propositions affecting very important points, with some of which I have myself great sympathy, on which the opinion of the House might have been registered. I hope that our judgment will not be obscured by the introduction of personal issues, against the raising of which I feel bound to make a most serious protest to the House. The hon. Member for Aberdeen, when the House was not so full as it is now, made an unmerited, an unjustified, and an unsupported attack upon the Commander-in-Chief.

Mr. PIRIE: I used language in the heat of debate which I withdrew, and for which I apologised.

Mr. BRODRICK: I am glad the hon. Member did apologise for the language he used, on my protest, with regard to the Commander-in-Chief; but he did not apologise for the language which he dared to use with regard to the Headquarters Staff—officers against whom no one will rise and dare to insinuate one wrong action, though the hon. Member spoke of the leprosy which tainted all their proceedings.

Mr. PIRIE: I quoted the words used by hon. Members opposite, by the Minister of Agriculture, and by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer.

* Mr. BRODRICK: What the late Chancellor of the Exchequer said, was that there was an attempt to influence the War Office with regard to appointments. That is not the point. What the hon. Member said, was that there was a taint of leprosy on the Headquarters Staff of the Army, and I appeal to the House of Commons. Here are men, every one of whom has served in the field in a campaign, I may say of the first magnitude, so far as our campaigns are of the first magnitude, every one of whom has earned the highest distinction; and I think I may say of them—I know I may say — that not one of them has had any advantage, socially or otherwise, such as has been alluded to by my hon. friend. These men are to be

accused of having the taint of leprosy on their proceedings when they sit in judgment on other officers of the Army!

MR. PIRIE: I deny that absolutely.

MR. BRODRICK: Then I hope the hon. Member will do more than apologise. I hope he will withdraw and express regret for that statement, which he ought to have known better than to make with regard to these officers.

MR. PIRIE: I said so. I expressed regret, so far as I was concerned.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): I think I was the person who originally used the term "leprosy." I think last year I said, with regard to the War Office, that ineptitude clung to the walls of that office like leprosy to its ward.

MR. BRODRICK: I referred just now to the impersonal allusions which we have had, but the hon. Member did not use the word in that way. He applied this offensive expression to men who are not here to speak in their own defence, and whose honourable records the hon. Member might envy. [Cries of "Order" and "Withdraw."] I am not going to allow these insinuations against the honour of the Headquarters Staff to go unchallenged. And I speak with more freedom because, unfortunately, the example of the hon. Gentleman has been imitated by my hon. friend the Member for Macclesfield. I am taking it point by point. I am very sorry that the hon. Member for Macclesfield, acting under very strong personal feeling, has again brought before Parliament the case of his relative, Colonel Kinloch, about whom I had a word to say to the House the other day; but the insinuations which he has made against the Commander-in-Chief oblige me most reluctantly, having myself endeavoured not to bring this case before the House, having carefully abstained from introducing any subject with regard to it that I could avoid — compel me, most reluctantly, to make good the action of the Commander-in-Chief in that case. I still cannot help thinking, even with all his personal feeling in the matter, he might have avoided the insinuations which he has made against the character of Lord Roberts.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: I have made no insinuations.

MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Gentleman is not aware of the expressions which he used. In the first place, he spoke of this question having been brought before Lord Roberts by two titled gentlemen.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: Is it not true?

MR. BRODRICK: The emphasis which he gave to that expression conveyed, and was intended to convey, the impression that Lord Roberts gave the representations of Lord Belhaven and Lord de Saumarez a degree of regard which he would not have given to others who were similarly circumstanced, but not equally influential. I do not want to discuss the social standing of Lord Belhaven or of Lord de Saumarez. They came to Lord Roberts as private individuals, relatives of officers who had been grievously wronged. They are, no doubt, Members of the Upper House of Parliament, but I believe I am right in saying that neither of them until yesterday, or the day before yesterday, ever took part in the deliberations of that Chamber. I do not suppose that any two Members of Parliament could have called upon Lord Roberts who had less public pressure of any sort or kind to bear upon him or with which to attempt to bear upon him. Lord Roberts received their representations as he would have received those of any individuals who, having relatives who had been wronged in a regiment, called upon him. My hon. friend made a great point of the fact that they called upon him at his private residence. What are the facts? He knows them, because they were in the papers yesterday. They called on him at the War Office, and because he was not there at the moment they followed him to his private residence. And that is looked upon as a private visit to influence the judgment of the Commander-in-Chief; and my hon. friend went on to say—he used the expression in the last words of his peroration—that he objected to, or protested against, these social and secret influences. The words were used—

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: Not in that reference at all.

MR. BRODRICK: Then I do not know what reference they were in; he was continuing on the same case. Now I am going to give my hon. friend one piece of information which may be new to him. It is quite true that Lord Belhaven and Lord de Saumarez called on Lord Roberts. Either of them, or both of them, had the most ample justification for doing so. And I will tell him this. Much has been said about social and secret influences in this matter. I know the facts. I know that, with the exception of these two relatives, one of whom conceived, and I will show the House in a few moments that he had a right to conceive, that his relative was deeply injured by what had occurred—with the exception of these representations, Lord Roberts and the War Office received no representation on behalf of the subalterns who were injured by these proceedings. I wish I could say the same on the other side. I would not have alluded to it unless it were necessary; but I say that, while my hon. friend is one of those who would have been the first, from a genuine feeling of indignation, to attack, protest, threaten the War Office with exposure unless they rescinded the decision which had been given against his relative, there was no amount of public or private pressure which could be brought to bear on Lord Roberts, on myself, on every other member of the War Office who could be got at which was not brought to bear by those who were concerned.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether that is addressed to me, because I do not understand it otherwise?

MR. BRODRICK: I have had interviews of hours' duration with the hon. Member. There has been no occasion that we have met that he has not spoken to me from a private and public standpoint on this question. I protest against this system of terrorism. I speak with feeling, because the hon. Member has forced it upon me. I say the social attempts, the attempts of titled persons, have not been on the side he suggests. I say they have all been on the other side, and they have been used for the purpose of endeavouring to hush up scandals which could not be hushed up. I will take my hon. friend on his own ground. He has said that Colonel Kinloch ought to have been tried by Court-martial. I think that the House, when they have heard the evidence, will think that there was no cause for a Court-martial in this case. A Court-martial may be called where an officer has committed an action, or has been guilty of a neglect which was prejudicial to good order or military discipline. Well, in this case Colonel Kinloch's career was brought before the Commander-in-Chief, not for the first time, by the visit of Lord de Saumarez. Lord Roberts took the only and proper course. He placed the matter in the hands of the General Officer Commanding the Home District on the following day. General Trotter ordered Colonel Ricardo, who commanded the Grenadier Guards, to make inquiries, and Colonel Ricardo assembled an inquiry. The Commander-in-Chief had ordered a further inquiry at Aldershot, where the 1st Battalion was, under Colonel Kinloch's command. In the interval before the inquiry at Aldershot took place, Colonel Ricardo's inquiry reported to the Adjutant-General. When that inquiry came to the Commander-in-Chief it disclosed evidence of Colonel Kinloch himself. Now the imputation made by Lord de Saumarez was this—that in the Grenadier Guards there existed in that battalion a system of bullying, a system which was not merely bullying of subalterns by subalterns, but which consisted of trying junior subalterns for military offences as well as for offences against the etiquette of the regiment, in each case the penalties being decreed by the senior subalterns. Well, the inquiry left no doubt whatever, nor was there any doubt in the minds of anybody connected with the 1st Battalion of the Grenadier Guards, that such practices existed. There was no conflict of evidence on that point. The whole conflict was, as between my hon. friend and myself to-night, to what extent Colonel Kinloch was mixed up in it.

Well, now I will just mention two cases to the House, cases on Colonel Kinloch's own evidence, without a word of anybody else's evidence. Colonel Kinloch admitted that a particular young officer—Lieutenant A—, no, I may as well give his name—

Lieutenant Leveson-Gower, had been recalled by him from leave in September last for having gone on leave without obtaining his permission. Lieutenant Leveson-Gower's case was that he had obtained leave from the senior staff officer under whom he believed at that moment he was serving. I do not say a word as to that proceeding except that he was recalled from Scotland in the middle of September; but he was severely censured by Colonel Kinloch. Colonel Kinloch then used an expression which he himself admits using—that he would call the senior subaltern's attention to his conduct for his condemnation. It seems he also specially warned the senior subaltern against there being any bullying in the matter.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: I am very sorry to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman, but I cannot possibly accept his description of this evidence, nor shall I have any opportunity of replying to it. I suggest that the right course is to lay this evidence on the Table and let the House read it for themselves.

MR. BRODRICK: There is no precedent for laying the evidence of a regimental inquiry before the House.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): Why quote it, then?

LORD HUGH CECIL: I rise, Sir, to a point of order. I wish to ask you whether a Minister is entitled to quote from a document which he does not propose to lay on the Table; and secondly, whether the merits of this dispute, in which I agree with my right hon. friend, are relevant to the subject under discussion?

*MR. SPEAKER: I certainly could not prevent the right hon. Gentleman or any other Member from going into the merits of the question of Colonel Kinloch's suspension. As regards the other question, the rule is that a Minister, if he quotes from a document, may be called upon to lay the Paper before the House; but that is subject to his statement that it would be contrary to the public interest so to do. He must take the responsibility for such a statement, and may act upon it.

MR. BRODRICK: I was not quoting from a document. I was most anxious to avoid laying Papers which would further enter into the matter, and mention names which I would most gladly avoid mentioning. But let it be fully understood that these Papers, if laid, are laid purely at the instance of my hon. friend and of the noble Lord. The noble Lord, who knows nothing about the subject, intervenes, in order to put before the public a description of affairs which have already been dealt with by the Commander-in-Chief, and for the production of which there is no precedent in the annals of the House. (Lord Hugh Cecil attempted to intervene.) The noble Lord will excuse me. This is a subject which is within my province, and which is in no respect within his. Greatly against my own wish, and absolutely against the advantage of discipline, I will consent, if the Papers are demanded to-morrow, to lay them on the Table. But I will now state what I wished to state with regard to Colonel Kinloch, and it is by no choice of mine that I embark on this subject. My hon. friend has chosen to impeach the justice, capacity, and impartiality of the Commander-in-Chief, and I should ill fulfil my duties in this House if I let that pass. Colonel Kinloch, in respect of Lieutenant Leveson-Gower, told the senior subaltern: "You will speak to this young officer firmly and quietly, and try to impress on him the way he should conduct himself as an officer. But remember, I will have no bullying." Mr. Leveson-Gower knew perfectly well what this meant—to those to whom it was addressed. He therefore appealed at once to the general officer commanding the district; but despite that appeal, for asking for leave from the wrong person, and after having been censured by his colonel, and having lost his leave and his position as signalling officer, to which he attached great importance—which was taken from him by the general officer commanding the district—he was, contrary to Colonel Kinloch's orders, brought before the subalterns and caned for having taken leave from the wrong person. My hon. friend will say that Colonel Kinloch was an aggrieved person in this matter. But it came to his ears. Here was an act of gross disobedience to his orders, and a clear example of a most improper system. Because, quite apart from the question whether the junior officers of his Majesty's Guards should flog one another, this was done in disobedience to Colonel Kinloch's orders. How did Colonel Kinloch deal with it? "I asked so-and-so why he had disobeyed my orders in having Mr. Leveson-Gower smacked. He said that he had ordered each of the lieutenants present politely to smack Mr. Leveson-Gower on the behind, and had taken particular care that he was not hurt in any way. I severely censured Lieutenant Cholmondeley for his gross disobedience to orders." Will any one tell me that this censure adequately expressed the feelings of the colonel and the feelings of the regiment at this instance of a practice of which he says he was wholly ignorant? In the opinion of the Commander-in-Chief that alone was sufficient to show that Colonel Kinloch had no such grave feeling in regard to these matters as might have been supposed. But that is not all. There was the case of Second-Lieutenant Hamilton. He was brought before Colonel Kinloch and admonished by him in the orderly-room before the adjutant. When Colonel Kinloch heard of these canings he called the subalterns before him, and asked if they had been bullied. Lieutenant R. Hamilton said——

> "A reign of terror exists. I have been tried by the subalterns' court-martial three times, and I have been licked on each occasion, once very severely."

Colonel Kinloch told him he would at once make inquiries. Colonel Kinloch asked him why he had not reported this to him, and he replied—

> "I thought you approved of these courts-martial, for when I got into a scrape over a year ago, you told me (before the adjutant) I deserved a good licking, and hoped I should get it."

Colonel Kinloch admitted that he used these words as a figure of speech before the adjutant, but he considered the behaviour so discreditable that he was compelled to use very strong language. Within a few hours Lieutenant Hamilton received a very severe and cruel caning from the subalterns.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: Why did not the right hon. Gentleman order a Court-martial upon that?

MR. BRODRICK: I am not going to have that plausible red herring thrown across the path. Here was a case where a colonel in the orderly-room permitted himself to use language which could only be interpreted by all who heard it——

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: Who were the "all"? I protest against that word "all."

MR. BRODRICK: The same man was in the orderly-room who was the president of a Court-martial on another occasion; and is it likely that Lieutenant Hamilton or any subaltern who heard of this episode would believe that the colonel would very seriously object to the use of this form of discipline? The case which Lord Roberts had before him was that in both these instances the officer commanding the first battalion, Colonel Kinloch, had been guilty of grave errors of judgment in his command. I do not want to press it any further, and would rather not even go into the further history after these incidents were discovered. There was what was called a mutiny of the subalterns—that is to say, a question of regimental etiquette had been interpreted into an order to drive in the drag under pain of caning if they did not do so, and the subalterns met to know if there was any release from this method of oppression. They met in the house of Lord Belhaven, himself an old officer. Apparently he advised them to go to their colonel with a written representation; but apparently it had also been discussed at the meeting whether they should go direct to the Commander-in-Chief. This was interpreted by the regimental authorities as a species of mutiny. I confess that my judgment, and that of every Member of the House who is not personally interested, would coincide with that of the Commander-in Chief, that to treat such an action as mutiny is a very severe straining of military law. The Commander-in-Chief had before him, upon these facts taken together, that practices of a very undesirable character existed in Colonel

Kinloch's regiment. He accepted Colonel Kinloch's statement that he was not aware of them; but, on the other hand, he had the fact that Colonel Kinloch had shown a want of judgment and supervision which, at all events, had induced the belief among the subalterns that he was not altogether averse to subaltern discipline upon subalterns. Lord Roberts had also before him the fact that this was the second time in six months Colonel Kinloch's name had been brought before him for trouble in his regiment. About six or seven months ago it was reported to Lord Roberts that one or two drummer boys had, contrary to the King's Regulations, been flogged in Colonel Kinloch's regiment, and presumably under the orders of the commanding officer. Sir, the King's Regulations do not permit of the flogging of drummer boys. Colonel Kinloch's plea on that occasion was the same as on the occasion of the caning of the subalterns, that he did not know about it. Well, Sir, the officer commanding had the adjutant as his eyes and ears. He is in close touch with his adjutant, and it is his business to know about these things. If he does not make it his business, and if the regiment is to get into a state which is described, rightly or wrongly, by the junior subalterns as a reign of terror, and if drummer boys are to be flogged, and if the relations of the senior subalterns are wholly wrong with regard to the junior subalterns, and if the adjutant does not do his duty—Sir, it is impossible to continue your confidence in the commanding officer. Lord Roberts was of opinion that the circumstances so disclosed, if they do not convey an imputation on Colonel Kinloch's honour, were, at all events, a serious imputation on his capacity and judgment; and no sentence of any court-martial would ever have availed to clear him in Lord Roberts's eyes and those of his adjutant-general, or of any other authority, from the conclusion that he was a man whose continuance in his command could not be tolerated.

This is not a case for trial by court-martial. The charge against Colonel Kinloch is that he was not efficient in the discharge of his duties; and if the Army is to exist we cannot retain the services of officers who are unable to perform their particular functions. But let me urge upon the House not to regard these objectionable practices, discovered in the case of one battalion, in the light of a reflection upon the mass of His Majesty's Guards. I cannot tell the House how deeply I regret that, owing to the attack upon the Commander-in-Chief, and the attempt to represent Colonel Kinloch as an aggrieved individual, I am forced to make public the facts upon which Lord Roberts based his judgment. But to make that the subject of a general attack on the discipline and etiquette of the Brigade of Guards would, indeed, be a serious national calamity. There is no body of His Majesty's troops which in any field in which they have been called upon to act has better proved its high qualities than the Foot Guards; and to cast a slur upon them because in one battalion, under exceptional circumstances, with all the senior officers at the front and a large number of subalterns practically without proper control, these regrettable practices occurred, would be nothing short of a grave injustice. I hope this subject will be allowed to end here.

Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: No.

Mr. BRODRICK: Then, if that be so, I must say one thing more. A great deal has been said that is unpleasant about the conduct of Mr. Leveson-Gower. I will read the confidential Report on his conduct as a soldier written a few months before these transactions, and the House will see he was not one of the worst officers in the regiment.

Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: Will you read Colonel Kinloch's Report?

Mr. BRODRICK: I think I ought to be allowed to proceed without interruption. This is the confidential Report. It is dated 11th July of last year:—

> "A very painstaking young officer; keen about everything he takes up, and anxious to get on. He distinguished himself in the signalling school at Aldershot. He is now instructor of signalling to the battalion. He takes the greatest possible interest in his work, and deserves great credit for the way he devotes himself to his duties. Quiet manners, good temper; tactful and gentlemanlike. He has been at Oxford; is popular with his brother officers. I can recommend him for promotion."

That is signed by Colonel Kinloch. And that is the officer whom the War Office was urged to remove.

Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: Not by Colonel Kinloch.

Mr. BRODRICK: That is the officer who, at Colonel Kinloch's instance was brought before the Commander-in-Chief in November to be relieved of his commission because he had ceased to be a credit to the regiment. Lord de Saumarez would never have gone to the Commander-in-Chief had it not been that a relative of his had received notice from the regimental authorities that on the following Monday Mr. Leveson-Gower would be called upon to resign his commission because he had ceased to be a credit to the regiment. That occurred in December about an officer whose confidential report in July was such as I have read. That in itself proves that the condition of the regiment under Colonel Kinloch was not satisfactory. If a young officer of whom everything promising can be said in July becomes a worthless and incorrigible officer in November, I think there is occasion to look at the system in the particular battalion in which the events have occurred.

I deeply regret that these personal questions have been brought into a question which should be wholly impersonal. So far as my feeling in this matter is concerned, I strongly desire that as many investigations as possible should be by Court-martial, but in the Army—it has been so from all time—it is impossible to place the lives of men in the hands of an officer who is incapable of looking after those men. We are urged by a specious use of language to frame a charge wherever it can be framed. Who is to be the judge of that? An officer impugned will always ask, if he so desires, that he should be charged under this Article—

> "Any man who is charged with any act of disorder or neglect to the prejudice of good order or military discipline may demand a Court-martial."

Let me take a case which came before me not very long ago—that of a man who had given orders in the field which had lost him the confidence of those immediately under him. The colonel reported that he could not give him command over a corporal's guard in the field again, that the men would not follow him, and that the position in which he had placed himself was perfectly well known in the regiment and the brigade. Lord Kitchener sent him home, and every species of appeal was made to the Commander-in-Chief and myself to give him a Court-martial. But how could we try a man by Court-martial for loss of nerve? Nobody assumed that he was a coward; no one assumed that he had viciously left undone things that he should have done. Nothing would have been more difficult than to frame a charge on which he could be convicted. What is the alternative? That we should send the man back and entrust to him the lives of 200 or 300 men, when every officer over him said he was unfit for the trust. You must have the power to remove men without Court-martial.

My hon. friend, I thought rather hardly on me, brought forward the case of Colonel Burroughes, who, in one of the expeditions on the West Coast of Africa, was deprived of his command and sent home. I saw the papers and read them very carefully. At this distance of time I should not like to attempt to give an accurate account of what occurred, but I know that the impression left on my mind was that Colonel Burroughes gave orders to those men which in our opinion he was not justified in giving, and which produced a mutiny. Supposing we had assembled a Court and recalled the men who had been damaged, most of whom were from Sierra Leone, to give evidence; what would have been the result? I do not know what the verdict would have been, but under no circumstances, after the facts had been disclosed to the Commander-in-Chief, could Colonel Burroughes have been entrusted with the same power over black men. His judgment and the way in which he had exercised his command made it absolutely impossible to employ him in such command again, and the Commander-in-Chief was obliged to tell him that he had failed so seriously in judgment that he must go on half-pay. You must have that power. It is all very well when civil questions are involved, but when it is a question of placing men's lives in the hands of a man with autocratic or absolute power you must have the right to tell him that he has failed in judgment and initiative and must be removed. Subject to that, I can assure hon. Members that in substance I entirely concur in the idea of Court-martials wherever possible. There is no one who would be a greater gainer than myself if a Court-martial could be resorted to in every case, and by having a verdict which would never come to the Secretary of State at all. But what would be the gain of the War Office would be absolutely fatal to efficiency in the Army. I cannot believe that those who have military experience on this side of the House will vote for a Resolution which, if it were passed, could never be carried into effect, and which no one entrusted with the administration of military justice would feel that it was possible to put into operation.

*MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) desired to recall the attention of the House to the subject they were supposed to be discussing. The Resolution, as placed on the Paper, had hardly been spoken to at all. The House had listened to a long speech from the Secretary of State for War—a speech consisting of an involved, not very clear, not very conclusive, and entirely *ex parte* statement of the case of the War Office against Colonel Kinloch, and the right hon. Gentleman had made against that officer charges which, whether justly or unjustly preferred, the House and the Secretary of State himself were utterly incompetent to decide, and which could be tried and decided only by a legal and judicial process in a court of justice. The whole debate was an object-lesson, enforcing the very principles which the hon. Member opposite desired to establish. If only the principle of trying officers where specific offences were alleged had been followed, they would not have had all the unsavoury details of this case dragged out in the House of Commons. The Army Act, which was put forward on the authority of Parliament for the government and discipline of the Army, contained a great number of specific charges on which officers might be tried, a most elaborate procedure was laid down for deciding whether or not the charges were true, but in nine cases out of ten the whole of that procedure and the protection the Act afforded to officers were brushed away, and the matters decided in a corner by some arbitrary process against which the officers impugned had no right of appeal whatever. Everybody recognised that there must co-exist in the Army two systems—the system by which penalties were inflicted on people who did wrong, and the system by which promotion was arranged and inefficient men dismissed from their commands. What the House ought to establish by this Resolution, was that wherever it was possible, humanly speaking, to prefer a definite charge against an officer it should be almost an honourable understanding and an obligation on the Secretary of State that that officer should be accorded full rights of trial.

He knew nothing of Colonel Kinloch, and cared nothing about the merits of his case. He had hoped for a discussion on very different lines, but certain statements had been made by the Secretary of State which would have afforded complete justification for one of the many charges mentioned being made the subject of a judicial investigation under the Army Act. The hon. Member for North Aberdeen deserved the gratitude not only of the House of Commons, but of the officers of the Army, for having brought forward the Motion. It was a great mistake to suppose that British officers liked to have their rights disposed of without the slightest opportunity of having their action investigated by a court of justice. Surely, as it was not a question of confidence or a question between Conservatives and Liberals, the House might decide this matter on its merits. The Resolution would not bind the military authorities; they would be free to interpret the law as they chose, though he had no doubt due weight would be given to the opinion of the House of Commons, and that, if carried, the Resolution would have the effect of causing an alteration in the present practice which, during the administration of the right hon. Gentleman, had so largely leaned to the side of arbitrary decision.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said that in the time remaining for discussion, it was impossible to go into the case as he would have desired to do, but he might say at once that he was a close personal friend of Colonel Kinloch, and an ardent, devoted, and loyal Grenadier, and the House was at liberty to discount the value of his opinion to whatever extent they liked on that account. The Secretary of State had been misled on many points, but he did not suggest that the Commander-in-Chief or anybody else connected with the War Office had been actuated by unworthy or sinister motives. His case, briefly put, was that if the impugned officer had had an opportunity to make clear his side of the matter, it was possible that, even if the sentence had not been altered, at all events general public opinion on the merits of the case would have been strangely different. The question as placed before the House separated itself into two parts—the case as between officers who thought they had been hardly treated and the War Office, and the case as between certain individuals and certain particular colonels. Great fault had been found with Colonel Kinloch because, after censuring an officer for gross disobedience, he "handed him over" to the senior subaltern. He himself had passed through the regiment from the rank of junior ensign to that of full colonel, and had had to do with these questions from the point of view both of junior ensign and of senior subaltern. He had been, to use Colonel Kinloch's words, "handed over," and what did it mean? It simply meant that a junior ensign, who did not know all that was expected of him, received the kindliest advice from his seniors, advice which in his own case had helped him over and over again. He felt so strongly about the manner in which this case had been treated that as a protest he should vote for the Resolution before the House.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 57; Noes, 185. (Division List No. 23.)

AYES.

Allen, Chas. P. (*Glos.*, *Stroud*)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cecil, Lord Hugh (*Greenwich*)
Channing, Francis Allston

Churchill, Winston Spencer
Craig, Robert Hunter (*Lanark*)
Davenport, William Bromley
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Charles M. (*Lanark*)
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt Hon Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (*Salop*
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lowther, C. (*Cumb. Eskdale*)
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
M'Crae, George
Nolan, Col. John P. (*Galway, N.*
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Seely, Mj. J. E. B. (*Isle of Wight*
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (*Hawick, B.*)
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (*Northants*
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, J. A. (*Glam., Gower*)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Walton, Joseph (*Barnsley*)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Wason, J. Cathcart (*Orkney*)
Weir, James Galloway
Wilson, F. W. (*Norfolk, Mid*)
Wilson, John (*Durham, Mid*)

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Pirie and Colonel Welby.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Aug. Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn, Sir H.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (*Man'r*
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (*Leeds*
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, E. (*Cork, S.*)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H
Cavendish, R. F. (*N. Lancs.*)
Cavendish, V C W (*Derbysh.*)
Cecil, Evelyn (*Aston Manor*)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J A (*Worc*
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Right Hon. Jesse
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Cox, Irwin Edwd. Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (*Antrim, S*
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, H. Shepherd (*Bolton*)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Jos. C.
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Ed.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (*West Ham*)
Greene, W. Raymond- (*Cambs*
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robt. Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Heath, Arthur H. (*Hanley*)
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, J. F. (*Sheff., B'tside*)
Howard, Jno (*Kent, Faver'sham*
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (*Glasgow*
Lawson, John Grant
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (*Bristol, S*
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas, Col. Francis (*Lowestoft*
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Killop, Jas. (*Stirlingshire*)
Majendie, James A. H.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Maxwell Rt Hn Sir H. E (*Wigt'n*
Maxwell, W. J. H (*Dumfriessh.*
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (*Hants.*
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (*Shropshire*
Morgan, D. J. (*Walthamstow*)
Myers, William Henry
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (*Bute*
O'Kelly, Conor (*Mayo, N.*)
O'Mara, James
Palmer, Walter (*Salisbury*)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, H. Pike (*Darlington*)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Redmond, William (*Clare*)
Reid, James (*Greenock*)
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (*Stalybridge*
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (*Sheffield*)
Robertson, H. (*Hackney*)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (*Liverpool*)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Saml. Alexander
Samuel, Herbt. L. (*Cleveland*)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.
Scott, Sir S. (*Marylebone, W.*)
Seely, Chas. Hilton (*Lincoln*)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (*Renfrew*)
Sinclair, Louis (*Romford*)
Smith, Abel H. (*Hertford, E.*)
Smith, H. C. (*Northmb. Tyneside*
Smith, Jas. Parker (*Lanarks.*)
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (*Strand*)
Stanley, Hon. A. (*Ormskirk*)
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir Jn. M.
Stock, James Henry

Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (*Chichester*)
Talbot, Rt Hn J. H. (*Oxford Univ*
Taylor, Austin (*East Toxteth*)
Thomas, Sir A. (*Glam., E.*)
Thomas, David A. (*Merthyr*)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. E. M.
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (*Exeter*)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (*Notts*)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. J. Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (*Dorset*)
Wilson, A. S. (*York, E. R.*)
Wilson, John (*Falkirk*)
Wilson, J. W. (*Worcester., N.*)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (*Bath*
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

BANK HOLIDAYS (IRELAND) BILL.

As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill read the third time, and passed.

THE WHITAKER WRIGHT CASE.

On the question that the House should adjourn,

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said that since he had asked the Home Secretary a question that afternoon as to whether he had taken any steps to secure that MR. Whitaker Wright should not evade justice by leaving the country he understood that he had absconded. He wished to know whether that was the fact, also whether the Home Office knew where Mr. Whitaker Wright was. The attention of the public was directed to this matter as they were determined to see that there was not one law for the rich and another for the poor. The Executive must bring this man to justice, or see that he did not escape justice.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said that if the hon. Gentleman was so anxious about the question he might have given him notice of it in writing or sent him some word of the fact. As soon as the question was asked he had applied to Scotland-yard, and had found that no application had been made there for a warrant for the arrest of Mr. Whitaker Wright. He had since heard from the City Police that a warrant had been granted at the Guildhall that morning, and was now in the hands of the City Police for execution. It was the intention of the Government that Mr. Whitaker Wright should be brought to justice, and if he were not in this country every effort of the Government would be directed to the end of bringing him back.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said that if Mr. Whitaker Wright had been allowed to escape the matter would require some explanation, as it had been known for some time that he was liable to be proceeded against. There had been cases in Ireland of men admittedly guilty of the gravest possible offences being allowed to escape from the country, and it would be interesting to learn whether the same practice was to obtain in England.

PUBLIC WORSHIP REGULATION AND CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 11th March; *Mr. Heywood Johnstone*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 69.]

Adjourned at twenty-three minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 12*th March*, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the following Bills ought to be dispensed with, and the Bills allowed to proceed.

Mid Yorkshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Derby Gas Bill [H.L.]; Shepshed Urban District Gas Bill [H.L.]; Preston and Horwich Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Chatham and District Light Railways Bill [H.L.]

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

South Staffordshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 1A, and 1B be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Macclesfield and District Electric Tramways Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13A, 17, and 17A be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Gosport, Fareham, and Cosham Tramways Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the local and road authorities to the said tramways be proved before the Committee on the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

South Lancashire Tramways Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that Tramways Nos. 3 and 4, be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the Atherton Urban District to the said tramways be proved before the Committee on the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Hove, Worthing, and District Tramways Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, and 18 be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Tynemouth and District Tramways Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 1A, 1B, 2, 3, 4, 4A, 5, 5A, 5B, 6, and 7 be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the—

Wakefield and District Tramways Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that Tramway No. 1 be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the Ardsley East and West District Council be proved before the Committee on the Bill.

Fife Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Barry Railway Bill [H.L.]; Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]; Hastings Tramways (Extensions) Bill [H.L.]; Hexham Gas Bill [H.L.]; London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill [H.L.]; Nantwich Gas Bill [H.L.]; South-Western and Isle of Wight Junction Railway Bill [H.L.]; Wellington (Salop) Gas Bill [H.L.]; British Gas Light Company (Norwich) Bill [H.L.]; Cleveland and Durham County Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Dudley, Stourbridge, and District Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Pelican and British Empire Life Office Bill [H.L.]; Plymouth and Stonehouse Gas Bill [H.L.]; Poole and District Electric Traction Bill [H.L.]; South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [H.L.]; Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Bill [H.L.]; Committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Bournemouth Gas and Water Bill [H.L.]; Exeter Railway Bill [H.L.]; Faversham Gas Bill [H.L.]; Knott End Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]; South Wales Mineral Railway Bill [H.L.]; Western Trust Bill [H.L.]; Wirral Railway Bill [H.L.]; Port Talbot Railway and Docks Bill [H.L.]; Queensland Investment and Land Mortgage Bill [H.L.]; Committed.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Manchester Southern Tramways (Cheshire) Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that the necessary consents of the local and road authorities to Tramways Nos. 1, 2, and 3 be proved before the Committee on the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Manchester Southern Tramways (Lancashire) Bill [H.L.]

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that the necessary consents of the local and road authorities to Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 7, 8, and 9 be proved before the Committee on the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Croydon and District Electric Tramways Bill

ought to be dispensed with, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 6 to 16 inclusive be struck out of the Bill; and the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 4, 4A, 5, 5A, and 5B be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the Penge Urban District Council to those tramways be proved before the Committee on the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Lancashire and Dumbartonshire Railway Bill

ought to be dispensed with, provided that Clauses 28 and 29 be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Bill

ought to be dispensed with, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1 and 2 be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Sheffield Corporation Bill

ought to be dispensed with, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 2 and 2A be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Metropolitan District Railway (Various Powers) Bill

ought to be dispensed with, provided that the powers to construct Railway No. 1 be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Wigan Corporation Tramways Bill

ought to be dispensed with, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 2 and 4 be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill

ought to be dispensed with, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 8, 8A, 9, and 9A be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the

Strabane and Letterkenny Railway Bill

ought to be dispensed with.

Read, and agreed to.

Scottish American Mortgage Company, Limited, Bill [H.L.]; Hastings Harbour District Railway Bill [H.L.]; Read 2ª.

Chard Corporation Gas and Electricity Bill [H.L.]; Plymouth and Stonehouse Gas Bill [H.L.]; Hexham Gas Bill [H.L.]; British Gas Light Company (Norwich) Bill [H.L.]; Nantwich Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Nantwich Gas Bill [H.L.]; Old Bridewell Burying Ground Bill [H.L.]; Cleveland and Durham County

Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill [H.L.]; Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills, viz.:

E. Northesk,
E. Dartrey (Chairman),
L. Saltoun,
L. Lilford,
L. Carew;

Agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Thursday next at eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

LONDON COUNTY ASYLUM (RECEIVING HOUSES) BILL [H.L.].

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD MONKSWELL: My Lords, I may as well say at once that in deference to the view of the noble Earl the Lord Chairman of Committees I do not propose to press the Second Reading of this Bill as a Private Bill. I do not in the least suggest that the judgment arrived at by the noble Earl is not a perfectly correct one, or that there is any grievance at all on that score; but in withdrawing this Bill I should like to say just a word or two about it. It will, I believe, reappear very much in the same form—perhaps in exactly the same form—as a Public Bill. This is a Bill to enable the County Council to establish Receiving Houses for alleged lunatics, to enable them to detain alleged lunatics there for six weeks, and to provide not only indoor treatment for the lunatics in the Receiving Houses, but also outdoor treatment for other persons whose condition may make it desirable that they should be treated in that way. Under the present law every alleged lunatic who is not under proper control must be brought into the workhouse, and that has been for a long time a great grievance. It is a grievance to the friends and relations of the persons brought in, because very often they are not paupers at all and do not wish the stigma of pauperism to rest upon them; and, in the second place, it is a very wasteful procedure, as there are thirty Boards of Guardians in London, every one of which must keep up a separate set of lunacy accommodation. Moreover, it is felt very strongly by medical men that if there was a better intermediate system for persons who are suspected of lunacy, and if they could get immediately better treatment than they now receive, there would be very much more chance of their ultimate recovery, and perhaps of their not having to be sent to an asylum at all. It is a rather curious thing that nearly half of the persons who are detained in workhouses as alleged lunatics do not go to asylums at all, but are sent back again.

This Bill was received with a perfect chorus of approval. It was received with approval by the Lunacy Commissioners, who thought a very strong and urgent case had been made out for legislation. It was received with approval by the Boards of Guardians, and a deputation waited on the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, and they considered that the noble Earl had given them a very satisfactory assurance indeed with regard to his approval of the principle of the Bill. The London County Council were never anxious that they should bring forward this measure themselves. They had no desire to put themselves forward in the matter, and they would have been only too glad if His Majesty's Government could have seen their way to have introduced a Bill on the subject; but, hearing that that course would not be pursued by the Government, the County Council introduced the Bill as a Private Bill. They introduced it as a Private Bill thinking that it would have much more chance of becoming law than if introduced as a Public Bill. But they entirely bow to the decision of the Lord Chairman, which they do not for a moment dispute, and all I have now to say is that some member of the London County Council, probably in your Lordships' House, will introduce a Bill having the same objects in view as the Private Bill, which I now withdraw.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of MORLEY): My Lords, I think my noble friend opposite has taken a very proper, and, if I may say so, judicious course with regard to this Bill, and I am very glad that he has called the attention of the House to it before withdrawing it on Second Reading. I feel very great sympathy with all he has said and with the County Council on this subject. I think it is a point that requires very serious consideration whether the law on the subject of lunacy, in particular, with respect to which this Bill deals, should not be amended as soon as possible, but when I came to investigate the Bill I found that it dealt with such very large amendments, both of the Lunacy Laws and of the Poor Law, that I did not think it was right—at any rate I felt very great doubts on the subject—that it should be allowed to proceed as a Private Bill. Having those doubts, I consulted my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack, and he agreed with me — I believe he also sympathises very much with the objects aimed at—that those objects ought to be effected by public rather than by private legislation. I think there is a very great evil to be obviated, and I sincerely hope that my noble friend will be successful in promoting legislation with regard to this subject in a Public Bill.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, so far as I understand them, a great many of the provisions contained in the Bill are very judicious provisions and might very properly be passed into law, but I think my noble friend himself will recognise that this is not a proper matter to be dealt with in a Private Bill. I doubt very much whether a Private Members' Bill dealing with such a subject would ever be carried into law, because it interferes with two important parts of government. As to the advisability of dealing with this matter, I entirely agree with the noble Lord. He will, perhaps, remember that I have twice introduced in this House and succeeded in passing Lunacy Law Amendment Bills dealing with the same subject, and I regret that time has not been found, owing to the congestion of business in another place, for these Bills even to be discussed there. They passed your Lordships' House, but nothing more was heard of them. For the last two sessions I have abstained from bringing forward Bills, because I do not think it is respectful to your Lordships that Bills passed here should never come on for consideration in the other House. I entirely concur with what my noble friend has done on this occasion, and if I could promise him my help I would; but, for the reasons I have given, I do not think a Private Bill can properly deal with such a subject. I do not wish to discourage the noble Lord, but I am afraid I cannot encourage him.

Order for the Second Reading discharged.

Bill, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

PETITION.

SHOPS (EARLY CLOSING) BILL [H.L.].

Petition in favour of: of shop assistants of Great Britain and Ireland; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY.

Officers compulsorily retired or dismissed the Service.

TRADE REPORTS.

Annual Series, No. 2942. United States (New Orleans and District).

MISCELLANEOUS, No. 1. (1903).

Reports on the laws on marriage and divorce in foreign countries (in continuation of Miscellaneous, No. 2 (1894)").

Presented by Command and ordered to lie on the Table.

LOAN SOCIETIES.

Abstract of accounts of Loan Societies in England and Wales, furnished to the Central Office, for the Registry of Friendly Societies, for the year ended 31st December, 1901: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILLS.

SHOP BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the Law relating to shops — Was presented by the Lord Sudley (*E. Arran*); read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 12.)

BANK HOLIDAYS (IRELAND) BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}; and to be printed. No. 13).

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION FOR THE STANDING COMMITTEE.

Report from, That the Committee have nominated the following Lords to serve on the Standing Committee:—

L. Archbishop of Canterbury.
E. Halsbury.
(*L. Chancellor.*)
L. Archbp. of York.
D. Devonshire.
(*L. President.*)
D. Bedford.
D. Northumberland.
D. Argyll.
M. Lansdowne.
M. Salisbury.
M. Bath.
E. Clarendon.
(*L. Chamberlain.*)
E. Derby.
E. Denbigh.
E. Stamford.
E. Chesterfield.
E. Shaftesbury.
E. Jersey.
E. Lauderdale.
E. Carnwath.
E. Stanhope.
E. Waldegrave.
E. Portsmouth.
E. Hardwicke.
E. Spencer.
E. Mansfield.
E. Malmesbury.
E. Westmeath.
E. Onslow.
E. Grey.
E. Morley.
E. Beauchamp.
E. Vane.
(*M. Londonderry.*)
E. Cawdor.
E. Camperdown.
E. Yarborough.
E. Innes.
(*D. Roxburghe.*)
E. Dartrey.
E. Northbrook.
E. Lytton.
E. Selborne.
E. Ancaster.
L. Crewe.
V. Falkland.
V. Sidmouth.
V. Gordon
(*E. Aberdeen*).
V. Hampden.
V. Cross.
V. Knutsford.
V. Llandaff.
V. Goschen.
V. Ridley.
V. Churchill.
L. Bp. London.
L. Bp. Hereford.
L. Bp. Rochester.
L. Zouche of Haryngworth.
L. Windsor.
L. Clifford of Chudleigh.
L. Barnard.
L. Saltoun.
L. Balfour.
L. Boyle.
(*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
L. Stewart of Garlies.
(*E. Galloway.*)
L. Ribblesdale.
L. Harris.
L. Rosebery.
(*E. Rosebery.*)
L. Poltimore.
L. Denman.
L. Kintore.
(*E. Kintore.*)
L. Leigh.
L. Elgin.
(*E. Elgin and Kincardine.*)
L. Belper.
L. Brougham and Vaux.
L. Kinnaird.
L. Lawrence.
L. Wolverton.
L. Sandhurst.
L. Aberdare.
L. Reay.
L. Tweedmouth.
L. Northbourne.
L. Herries.
L. Monkswell.
L. Ashbourne.
L. Brassey.
L. Thring.
L. Macnaghten.
L. Ashcombe.
L. Newton.
L. Hawkesbury.
L. Stanmore.
L. Welby.
L. Davey.
L. Burghclere.
L. James.
L. Heneage.
L. Coleridge.
L. Fermanagh.
(*E. Erne.*)
L. Norton.
L. Lamington.
L. Rowton.
L. Ludlow.
L. Glanusk.
L. Avebury.
L. Alverstone.
L. Allerton.

Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House as the panel of Lords to act as Commissioners under the Act. viz:—

E. Stamford,
L. Muncaster;

Agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly.

SHOPS (HOURS OF CLOSING) BILL [H.L.].

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*LORD RIBBLESDALE: My Lords, I commend this Bill to your Lordships as not being a Party Bill, and I think I can also recommend it to the House as a body, and to your Lordships as individuals, on the public grounds of advantage and necessity. I daresay it will be within your Lordships' recollection that in the House of Commons the other night, on Mr. Price's Motion on the Address, there was a quick-firing debate on this very subject. The public grounds of advantage and necessity to which I have alluded were admitted on both sides of the House, and in that respect two main propositions were well stated by Mr. Asquith as now being matters of common agreement. The first of these propositions was the gravity of the evil which this Bill is drafted to remedy, and the second proposition was the inefficiency, so far, of voluntary effort to deal with the evil. Alas, from its very nativity, my Bill attracted the attention of the noble Earl (the Earl of Wemyss), who guards with such zeal and capacity the paradise of liberty and property. His flaming but ever chivalrous sword leapt from its scabbard, and, if the House will forgive a mixed metaphor, he put a Motion down at once on the Paper for the rejection of my Bill. I feel that I shall have to address one or two observations to the noble Earl, and the first question I should like to ask him, though I quite admit the sonorous sound of the "liberty of the subject," is whether in social matters there are any such things as abstract rights, or absolute principles, or indefeasible laws. I hold with Hobbes the philosopher, that in these days the liberty of the subject is very like the desolate freedom of the wild ass, and I think that telephones, motor cars, and wireless telegraphy have more or less upset most of our ideas of being able to carry abstract notions of that sort into everyday life. However, my Lords, I quite recognise that this is not a debating society—I sometimes wish we were a little more like one—and I will not therefore pursue this rather unfertile inquiry further. I will come down to more common gound.

I think the noble Earl might very justly say, "Why should a man who pays rent, rates, and taxes, and takes the risk of business, and so on, not be allowed to keep his place open as long as he likes, as long as he can get people to work, and to conduct his business in the way which he chooses and which he considers suits his particular trade best?" My answer there again depends upon the two propositions which Mr. Asquith put in the House of Commons, and I say that what I think would justify us in preventing him doing so in these days, is the welfare of the community and our general responsibility to do all that we can to improve a certain set of social conditions, which, as I have just said, it is a matter of common agreement on both sides, merit and justify attention, or, as the noble Earl, I suppose, would describe it, interference. I will try to convince the noble Earl of the moderation of my Bill, and also of the fact that its provisions are drafted with due regard to sensitive and complicated considerations, which I recognise quite as fully as the noble Earl does, and which make this a difficult, and at the same time an interesting, question. I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that the vantage ground—the "jumping off place"—of my Bill is the Report of the Select Committee on Shop Hours in 1901, and that it gives expression to what I conceive to be not merely the spirit, but the letter, of Lord Salisbury's recommendation. I think the House will agree that Lord Salisbury's opinion on any question of this sort will always be entitled to great consideration. But I would remind the House that Lord Salisbury served upon this particular Committee, that he heard all the evidence, that the case which was being investigated before him and the Committee was to the satisfaction of the Committee proved up to the hilt, and that it was agreed that something must be done; and I feel convinced that in these circumstances Lord Salisbury's special recommendation that Town Councils should be given the power to grant provisional orders to deal with this question of shop hours is entitled to every acceptation from your Lordships.

Now, my Lords, I turn to the other Bill which is to come before you to-night—viz., the one standing in the name of Lord Avebury. That is a Bill with which we have already been made familiar. I think it has been introduced in this House twice, though perhaps not in the same form; and I hope, although I am running, as it were, a Bill of my own, that the noble Lord will allow me to pay him the high tribute to which I feel he is entitled for the work he has done in regard to this question. I look upon him as the Admirable Crichton and the past-master in the matter of shop hours and a great many social subjects of the same kind. But at the same time I should also like to remind him that when we were very feeble folk on this question, when opinion was not at all formed into the mass that it now assumes, I was one of a minority of those who voted, against the opinion of my own Front Bench, with the noble Lord behind me. I have been thinking over this Bill a long while, and have had a great many conversations with those who know something about the question and are in touch with the people most affected, and with every regard for the noble Lord's Bill, I very much prefer my own. I will state briefly the grounds of preference. In the first place, I claim that my Bill sticks more topically to the Report of the Select Committee, and especially to Lord Salisbury's recommendation. In the next place, I claim for it greater simplicity and flexibility; and thirdly, I attach great importance to this, that my Bill is more obedient to the wise tendency of the present day, which recognises that the success of this kind of legislation must largely be a matter of circumstance, and which therefore trusts the local authorities to adopt the principle, to deal with details, and to frame provisions to meet the needs and the convenience of the communities they represent.

I will now pass to my Bill, and explain it as clearly as I can. Fortunately, in addition to being simple, it is very short. In the first clause, my Bill goes a little beyond the recommendations of the Lords Committee by empowering both Urban and District Councils, as well as Borough Councils, to make these Provisional Orders. The reason for that, I think, is simple. There are big urban districts, larger and more important than many boroughs, which could not very well be left out. Some rural districts are really more urban in character than rural. I will take, for instance, the mining districts in South Wales, and I have no doubt instances could easily be multiplied. The distinction, indeed, is only technical. As your Lordships know, rural districts now have, under the general law, means of acquiring the sanitary powers of Urban District Councils. Here I would point out that the making of a provisional order is purely voluntary under this Bill. It is almost only an enabling Bill, and there is nothing to enforce early closing in any form in a reluctant district.

Now I come to the only coercive part of the Bill. In the second clause I use the word "shall" instead of "may." I make it absolutely compulsory on the central authority, which I define later in the Bill, to lay the Provisional Order before Parliament; that is, the central authority have not the power under my Bill to reject or to amend it. I have, unfortunately, come away without the reference in my pocket, but I believe there is a precedent for that—I don't say an exact analogy—in the Allotment Act of 1887. The noble Lord shakes his head, but I don't attach very much importance to it one way or the other. I think it is a good clause by itself, whether it has a precedent or not. It would be wasting a good deal of time if the whole matter was gone into after the Provisional Order had been put before the central authority by the local authority, and the principle of my Bill is the principle which noble Lords opposite followed so implicitly in their own Education Act of last year, when they handed over the whole of the education of the country to local authorities.

As to the third clause, which deals with expenses, I think that is quite plain sailing. It would have added considerably to the length of the Bill if I had defined exactly the source from which the money to be paid, for the expenses consequent upon getting the Provisional Orders, was to be found in each case. Nor have I found it necessary to limit expenditure, though I believe some limit of expenditure was suggested in the recommendations of the Committee. The definitions call for no comment. I am glad to see that my definitions are practically in agreement with Lord Avebury's. My "shop" definition is the same as Lord Avebury's, except that he includes the barber, and I do not. I leave it to the local authority to define and to specialise particular shops. That, I think, concludes my explanation of the Bill.

I might here go into the ethical and hygienic aspects of this question —I might, but I will not. I think those are very fully dealt with in the Memorandum to Lord Avebury's Bill, besides which I see around me many noble Lords, both spiritual and temporal, who have given great attention to this subject, who have studied it longer than I have, and who no doubt will have something to say with authority on these matters. I think we shall all agree that people who have to serve very long hours in shops, often in bad air, must lead rather dull lives. The man who is known as the "Guv'nor" may derive a great deal of amusement out of keeping his shop open late, but I am thinking more of the shop assistants, who are not dealing on their own account, and are kept long hours at the dull business of serving customers. That, of course, I only put forward in a very general way, and I leave it to other noble Lords, who are more competent to do so, and especially to the noble Lord behind me, to enlarge upon that aspect of the question. I need hardly say that I prefer my own Bill. I declare to win with mine if I can, but I shall be very glad to win with either. My noble friend and I both recognise that we are working towards the same end. If I cannot get my Bill I hope my noble friend will get his; but I confess I can hardly conceive, having regard to what the Home Secretary said in the debates in the House of Commons on Mr. Price's Amendment to the Address, that there will be any hostility on the part of the noble Lords opposite to my Bill. Encouraged again by what the Home Secretary said in the House of Commons, and inasmuch as my Bill sticks closely to Lord Salisbury's recommendation, and to the Report of the Select Committee, I hope that it may be given a cordial welcome, and that its passage will be facilitated in another place. I address myself once more to those who may be disposed to follow the noble Earl on the Cross Benches in the "undue interference" ground of objection which I assume he will take to this Bill, and I would remind them of a maxim which may serve to appease their conscientious objections—*Salus populi suprema lex.*

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Ribblesdale.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The EARL of HALSBURY): I interpose thus early in the debate because I think your Lordships are somewhat embarrassed by the form in which these two Bills appear. It seems to me that the noble Lord who has just sat down has, by Parliamentary tactics, obtained precedence over Lord Avebury, who I certainly think is entitled to precedence by reason of the attention he has given to this subject, and the mode in which he has brought it forward from time to time. Personally, I should vote against the Bill now before the House, and in favour of Lord Avebury's Bill. It seems to me that it would be extremely unfair to Lord Avebury, who has taken so much trouble over the matter, and whose Bill is very detailed and deals with a great many of the difficulties, if, as would be the case if Lord Ribblesdale's Bill were rejected, he was prevented from moving his. For your Lordships could not, after having rejected one Bill, receive another almost identical with the one you had thrown out, during the same session. Lord Ribblesdale has taken credit for his Bill on the ground that it is a short one; but it is a short one because it has, by not mentioning them, avoided all the difficulties with which Lord Avebury has attempted to deal. The Motion I make is that your Lordships adjourn this debate. You would then be able to hear what Lord Avebury had to say in moving his Bill. I do not think it would be in order to discuss both Bills together. It would be possible to refer both of them to a Committee, but neither of the noble Lords, I understand, desires that that should be done, because it would be regarded, and justly regarded, as a mode of shelving the question. To put your Lordships in a position properly to decide on this question, I move that the debate on Lord Ribblesdale's Bill be now adjourned.

Moved, "That the debate on the Bill be now adjourned."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: Should I be in order in moving the rejection of the Bill as an Amendment to that Motion?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: No. The Motion is that this debate be now adjourned.

EARL SPENCER: Do I understand that if the noble and learned Lord's Motion is agreed to, Lord Avebury will introduce his Bill?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Certainly.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: But I put it to the noble and learned Lord, with a view to obtaining the very object which he has in view, that it would be better to adjourn the debate after the debate has been held to some extent; otherwise you are going to burk all discussion of Lord Ribblesdale's Bill. That, I submit, is not fair.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: The question is——

LORD RIBBLESDALE: Before the noble and learned Lord puts the Motion, I must say that I do not think the treatment I am receiving is at all fair. I understood the noble and learned Lord to say that I was hardly entitled to bring forward this Bill, because I had not given the same attention to the subject as the noble Lord behind me. I am sure Lord Avebury will bear me out in saying that I recognise to the full all he has done, and that I am only too anxious to work with him. I deny that I have resorted to any Parliamentary wiles in order to obtain first place for my Bill.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I did not say that.

LORD RIBBLESDALE: I respectfully submit that I am receiving a scant measure of justice at the hands of the noble and learned Earl.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: The question is——

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: Before we come to a decision on this subject, I think we should hear what the Leader of the House has to say. The noble Earl on the Woolsack has accused my noble friend of having indulged in Parliamentary wiles——

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I beg your pardon, I did nothing of the kind. I said "tactics."

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: I accept the noble and learned Lord's correction. I do not see there is much difference between "wiles" and "tactics." But whatever the charge against my noble friend may be, I submit that you will be dealing scant courtesy to him if you adjourn the debate in the way proposed. I and many other noble Lords think that Lord Ribblesdale's Bill is a better Bill than Lord Avebury's, and if by no unjustifiable methods, and after reasonable and due notice, my noble friend's Bill happens to have got precedence of Lord Avebury's, I hold that in fairness your Lordships should give first consideration to Lord Ribblesdale's Bill. Decide on that Bill, and, if you reject it, then take Lord Avebury's Bill. For my own part, I hope my noble friend will not consent to an adjournment of the debate, but will test the feeling of the House by going to a division.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The DUKE of DEVONSHIRE): I do not think the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack either made, or intended to make, any accusation against the noble Lord opposite.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Hear, hear.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: All that is suggested to the House is that considering Lord Avebury's long connection with this question, and also looking at the manner in which the two Bills deal with the subject, it would be more convenient to take the general discussion upon the Bill which happens to stand second rather than that which stands first. The Motion for the adjournment will not get rid of Lord Ribblesdale's Bill, and if Lord Avebury's Bill should not commend itself to the House, it will be in the power of Lord Ribblesdale to put the discussion on his Bill down for another day.

On Question, their Lordships divided:—Contents, 35; Not-Contents, 33.

CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.
Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Devonshire, D. (*L. President.*)

Marlborough, D.

Ailesbury, M.

Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Cowper, E.

Denbigh, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Morley, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Stamford, E.
Stanhope, E.
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*)
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]
Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
Goschen, V.

Hampden, V.
Ridley, V.

London, L. Bp.

Ashcombe, L.
Balfour, L.
Barnard, L.
Belper, L.
James, L.
Kinnaird, L.

Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Muncaster, L.
Norton, L.
Oranmore and Browne, L.
Suffield, L.
Wimborne, L.
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Ripon, M.

Camperdown, E.
Chesterfield, E. [*Teller.*]
Ducie, E.
Grey, E.
Lytton, E.
Romney, E.
Russell, E.
Spencer, E.
Gordon, V. (*E. Aberdeen.*)
Peel, V.
Aberdare, L.
Acton, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Coleridge, L.
Davey, L.
Denman, L.
Farrer, L.
Hylton, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Meldrum, L. (*M. Huntly.*)
Northbourne, L.
Ribblesdale, L. [*Teller.*]
Robertson, L.
Rosebery, L. (*E. Rosebery.*)
Shute, L. (*V. Barrington.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stanmore, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Tweedmouth, L.
Wandsworth, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wentworth, L.

EARL SPENCER: The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack having managed to get rid of one Bill by tactics of a kind that we have not been accustomed to in this House, I should like to ask whether it is right and in order, after a Bill has been shunted in this way, to bring on immediately afterwards an almost identical Bill. It seems to me that if the first one was out of order, the other one is too, and I should be disposed to say that the second Bill ought to be adjourned as well. I have never known of a Bill having been got rid of in this manner before. By the Motion which the House has just accepted, Lord Avebury's Bill can now be discussed, whereas Lord Ribblesdale's Bill has been refused any discussion at all.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: I should like to support the argument of my noble friend Lord Spencer, and I——

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I would point out to noble Lords that there is no Motion before the House.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: Then I move the adjournment of the House, and I do so in order to obtain a decision on the Question whether it is in order, one Bill on a particular subject being on the Paper, to pass from that Bill and take up another Bill not differing at all from it in character, and only differing to some small extent in its provisions. What was the reason given by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack for moving the adjournment of the debate on my noble friend's Bill? It was that if your Lordships gave a Second Reading to Lord Ribblesdale's Bill you would be placed in a very awkward position in not being able to proceed to debate Lord Avebury's Bill.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I said if the Bill was rejected.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: I maintain that the question whether the Bill was rejected or not, makes no difference.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: It would make all the difference. In the event of its being rejected, you would be precluded from discussing the Bill, on the same subject standing in the name of Lord Avebury.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: These Bills are so very much alike that in Committee the terms of one could be substituted for the other. If a second reading had been given to Lord Ribblesdale's Bill, the whole of the provisions of Lord Avebury's measure might have been inserted in Committee. In these circumstances, in order to protect the dignity of the House, I move the adjournment.

Moved, "That the House do now adjourn."—(*Lord Tweedmouth.*)

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: I submit that neither of the noble Lords opposite who have spoken, has brought forward any point of order whatever; certainly they have not supported it by any precedent. The adjournment of the debate on Lord Ribblesdale's Bill was moved by my noble and learned friend on the ground that of the two Bills before the House, it was desirable that a discussion should be taken on that which stood second. I deny altogether that there was anything either irregular or discourteous in that. What the point of order is that has been raised by noble Lords opposite I am at a loss to discover. The course which has been taken appears to me not only to be a convenient one, but almost an absolutely necessary one. I am informed that if the Bill which was moved just now had been debated, and rejected after discussion by the House, it would have been impossible for Lord Avebury to have moved his Bill. Therefore, by taking the discussion on that Bill we should have placed ourselves in the position of being unable to discuss the Bill which, in its form and general character, we think the most preferable one of the two.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: If my noble friends are liable to the charge which has been brought against them by the noble Duke of proceeding in this matter without precedent, they have before them, at any rate, the example of the Lord Chancellor, who has proceeded in this matter entirely without precedent. I have had no time, as the noble Duke has apparently had, to ransack the journals of the House for precedents on this matter, since the last division——

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: What I said was, that the noble Lords had risen to a point of order, and they did not explain what the point of order was. I said they ought to have brought forward some precedent to show that the course taken by my noble and learned friend was a breach of order.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: Under what Standing Order has the Lord Chancellor proceeded?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Under the Standing Orders relating to the Speaker of the House.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: The adjournment of the House has been moved as a protest against the unprecedented action of the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack. To what date is the Bill adjourned?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Till the next meeting of the House.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: Then we shall have the advantage to-morrow of a second debate on Lord Ribblesdale's Bill. Is that the intention of the Motion?

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: If the noble Earl wishes to have the debate to-morrow, I suppose he can have it.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: I have nothing to do with it. I am neither the Leader of the House nor the promoter of either of the Bills; but what we on this side of the House, and some of the supporters of the noble Duke, would like to know is, why has this extraordinary course been taken? I would undertake to find, if leisure were given me, a dozen precedents on which two Bills on the same subject have been read a second time on the same day and referred to a Select Committee. Is it supposed that the Debate on Lord Ribblesdale's Bill would have taken so long that it would have interrupted the sacred hour of dinner, and so prevented any discussion being taken on Lord Avebury's Bill? I do not understand that there is any pretext of the kind, and really the object of those who voted against the Lord Chancellor's Motion for Adjournment, and who have brought forward the new Motion for Adjournment, is to discover what underlies this strange proceeding on the part of the Government.

*THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH): I would venture to remind the House of the particular point which the noble Duke the Leader of the House made, and the reason he gave for the course which has been taken. The point which the noble Duke put was this, that supposing the debate on Lord Ribblesdale's Bill had gone on, and supposing that Bill had been rejected, it would have been impossible, by the custom, and, I think, the Orders of this House, for the noble Lord Avebury to have moved his Bill. The object which I had thought had been attained by the Motion of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack was this, that Lord Ribblesdale's Bill had not been rejected, but the discussion on it postponed until we saw whether the House would accept Lord Avebury's Bill or not. Lord Ribblesdale's Bill has not been killed, but is kept alive by only being postponed. I think that was a reasonable and rational course under all the circumstances. Having regard to the history of this question, it was only fair that the main discussion should be taken on the Bill introduced by Lord Avebury; and I think it was for the convenience of the House that the main discussion should be taken on the Bill, which, I believe, will be found to be the one most in accord with the wishes of the majority of the House.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: If the Bill to be moved by Lord Avebury is rejected, then, under the rule which has just been laid down by the noble Duke and by the noble Lord the Secretary for Scotland, Lord Ribblesdale's Bill cannot be discussed at all. That will land the House in a very remarkable position. I have been in this House now for a longer time than I care to recollect, but I have never known such a proceeding as this. I confess it seems to me to be a wholly irregular procedure. This is an attempt to alter the order in which the Bills stand on the Order Paper. It is possible, I suppose, to do it in this way without committing an actual breach of order, but it is entirely contrary, as it seems to me, to the spirit of the Orders of this House; and if Lord Avebury's Bill should not pass, then you will have successfully secured that no consideration whatever shall be given to the other Bill.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I, too, have been in this House for a good many years, and can corroborate every word that has fallen from the noble Marquess. I should like to know why the House is unable to discuss two Bills which deal with the same subject in a different way. I have no recollection of this ever occurring before.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: I can off-hand give the noble Earl a precedent. Lord Avebury's Bill was rejected last year, and it was re-introduced without the Clause to which exception was taken, and the previous question was moved and carried on the very ground, that it was out of order to discuss a Bill when one on the same subject had just been rejected.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: If that is all the precedent that the noble Lord can produce, it is no precedent at all. The case which is now before the House is this: Lord Ribblesdale puts down a Bill which he proposes to bring before the House, and Lord Avebury also puts down a Bill which he desires to introduce. The House comes to Lord Ribblesdale's Bill first, and has no reason to know, further than seeing the notice on the Paper, what is in Lord Avebury's Bill. Lord Ribblesdale's Bill comes up for discussion, upon which a Motion is made that it be not discussed. Well, my Lords, I do not see how that can be said to have any reference to what happened with regard to Lord Avebury's Bill last year. Lord Avebury's Bill was introduced in one form on one day and in another form on another day, but I do not see how that has any reference at all to the position now before the House. What is there, or what would there have been, to prevent the House reading Lord Ribblesdale's Bill a second time, as well as Lord Avebury's, if it saw fit? I believe Lord Ribblesdale's Bill is rather more peremptory than Lord Avebury's, but is that any reason why the Bills should not have been discussed in their proper turn; or would it be contrary to practice to refer the two Bills to a Select Committee? I have known the same thing to be done many times since I have had a seat in this House, and it was for that reason that I voted against the Motion moved by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: I only moved the adjournment of the House to put myself in order. I do not propose, therefore, to press my Motion to a division, but I think I can say, on behalf of my noble friend beside me, that we shall certainly divide on the question of the adjournment of the debate on Lord Avebury's Bill, on the principle that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

*LORD BARNARD: In view of what has been said, I should like to ask whether, assuming Lord Avebury's Bill is read a second time, Lord Ribblesdale's Bill will in that case come on?

Motion for the adjournment of the House (by leave) withdrawn.

SHOPS (EARLY CLOSING) BILL [H.L.]

[SECOND READING]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*LORD AVEBURY: My Lords, I rise to address you this evening with a deep sense of responsibility, because I know the intense anxiety with which your decision is awaited by thousands and thousands of our countrymen and countrywomen, who feel that on your verdict rests the health and happiness of their lives. This is no new Question. It has been for more than thirty years before the House of Commons. We have been supported by two unanimous resolutions of the House of Commons; our Bill has passed twice through Second Reading in that House, and it has passed through two Committees, but we were never able to get it through all its stages in one session. The House always supported us, but obstruction has hitherto been victorious. Two years ago your Lordships appointed a Committee to inquire into the whole subject. The noble Marquess (Lord Salisbury) was good enough to serve on it, and I am sure that I express the general feeling of the shopkeeping community in expressing to him their thanks for having devoted to the inquiry so much of his valuable time. We held many sittings, heard a great deal of evidence, and came to a unanimous Report. Your Committee, in their Report, state as the result of their inquiries that in many places the hours of labour in shops range as high as eighty to ninety a week, making fourteen hours a day. In factories the hours are now fifty-six and a half, so that those shops are now actually working thirty hours a week longer than factories.

We have had Bill after Bill, and Act after Act dealing with factories. Why should nothing be done for the shopkeeping community? I would ask your Lordships to consider what fourteen hours a day mean. Allow eight hours for sleep, and two for getting to and from the shop, for dressing and undressing, for breakfast and supper, and the twenty-four are gone. There is not a moment for relaxation or fresh air, for self-improvement or family life. They have the Sunday, a blessed day of rest, but, under such circumstances, of rest and nothing more. Men so over-worked cannot be useful citizens; women, as the medical authorities pressed on us, gradually fade away, and they can never become the mothers of strong and healthy children. This is a most serious consideration, and imposes on us a great responsibility. It would be vain to enlarge on the terribly long hours and the evil they entail. Let me just give you one case. Mr. Wallauer, who represented the London Master Bakers' Society, some 6,000 to 7,000 employers, told us that he and his colleagues employ between them from 18,000 to 20,000 women, of whom nine-tenths are now working ninety hours a week. His society supports the Bill, because, as he said, these hours—

> "Are unnecessarily long and exceedingly cruel, and it is white slavery for the 18,000 to 20,000 females whom I refer to in our own one trade."

I speak, indeed, for over 300 shopkeepers' associations, representing all trades and in all parts of the country, all of whom support our Bill, while, as far as we know, only two oppose it. Your Committee also point out that in such a matter the trade unions may fairly be considered to represent the working classes, and the Trade Councils of England, Scotland and Ireland all support legislation, while indeed some of them wish to see the Bill made more stringent. There are two Bills before your Lordships this afternoon dealing with the same subject. As your Lordships will see by the Paper which has been circulated this morning, the Bill which I am now moving is supported certainly by seven out of the nine members of the Committee appointed by your Lordships to inquire into the subject, and I have every reason to hope by the other two also. Our Bill, in fact, is the Bill of the shopkeepers, and it is the Bill of your Lordships Committee. Lord Ribblesdale's Bill is his own. Our objects are the same, and I have to thank him for his support on previous occasions. His

Bill differs from ours in some important respects, and I confess that the provisions do not seem to me to be improvements. He proposes that it should be administered not by the Home Office but by the Local Government Board. I have always understood that the Home Office is the proper Department to deal with the subject. They have the information and the experienced staff. That, however, is a matter for the Government.

My noble friend, Lord Ribblesdale, in the Memorandum prefixed to his Bill, says that it is introduced for the purpose of carrying out the recommendation of the Committee. But I submit that he does not do so. The Committee recommended that any order made by the Home Office should be submitted to Parliament, but my noble friend goes further and proposes that it should not come into effect until embodied in an Act of Parliament. If Parliament agrees, as I hope it will, to the general principle, the exact hours in each case might well be left to the shopkeepers, the local authority, and the Home Office. It may, and no doubt often will, happen that some small or temporary change may be desirable, for the week, let us say, before Christmas, in holiday resorts at the height of the season, or on the occasion of some great function. But under the noble Lord's Bill every change, however small, however temporary, would require an Act of Parliament, and would therefore practically be impossible. This proposal would, I fear, involve considerable delay, unnecessary expense, and render the Act more difficult to work.

Lord Ribblesdale's Bill is no doubt shorter than ours, but that is because he omits many things which are of great importance. Under his Bill the whole area under one Local Authority must be treated alike. But this is not always desirable, or even possible. Take London. Saturday is generally recognised as a holiday in some parts of the Metropolis: it is the longest day in others. You could not make Saturday a half-holiday, or even an early day, in the poorer parts of London. In the counties, again, different towns have different habits and different requirements. So, again, in many cases trades may require special treatment. Let us take one case—the chemists. Under my noble friend's Bill a chemist would be fined for selling medicine after the shop closed. We have a special clause, approved by the chemists themselves, to meet this point. The last difference to which I will refer is that we leave the initiative to the shopkeepers themselves. The principal objection we have hitherto had to meet is the fear that our Bill might ruin the small shopkeepers. To this we have always replied that the Act could not be put into operation against their wishes. With this provision I believe the small shopkeepers are quite safe, and quite satisfied, but to some such provision they do attach importance; and though two-thirds is perhaps too large a proportion—and personally I should be glad to say instead a majority—still it seems very important in such a matter to carry the shopkeeping community with us. I am not afraid that local authorities would do anything unreasonable, but they might, whereas under our Bill shopkeepers know they are, and would be, safe.

Our Bill has been considered clause by clause, and I might say line by line, by two representative congresses of shopkeepers—always, of course, excepting the additional safeguard, which, somewhat reluctantly, we have accepted in deference to the great authority of Lord Salisbury—and it is supported by over 300 associations of shopkeepers representing all our great trades and all our great cities. Lord Ribblesdale's Bill, on the other hand, so far as it differs from theirs, the shopkeepers have had no opportunity of examining. The noble Lord below me (Lord Wemyss) has on former occasions denounced the Bill in his usual picturesque and vigorous language. He professes to speak in the interests of the small shopkeepers. But they have always been the backbone of our movement. And why? They believe that they will get more rest and leisure, that their health will be better, that they will save in gas and other expenses, and last, but not least, that they will do more business. I have always maintained that they would do as much, but there is among them a general belief, for which several of their witnesses gave good reasons, that they will do more. They allege firstly that if shops shut earlier people will buy what they want nearer home; and, secondly, that more will be spent in the shop and less in the public-house.

Happily, my Lords, this is no question of employers against employed, or class against class. This is the shopkeepers' own Bill. They deplore the evil, and implore you to enable them to apply a remedy. Your Committee heard every Association which desired to give evidence. Over 300 support the Bill, and only two oppose it. My Lords, I cannot sum up the question better than in the words of the unanimous Report of your Lordships' Committee. They have told you that "the subject is one of urgent importance," that "in many places the hours of labour in shops range as high as eighty to ninety per week," that the heads of the two great medical colleges "have come before us and spoken strongly on the great and increasing evils of the present long hours;" that "such serious warnings from the heads of the medical profession cannot in our judgment safely be disregarded;" that "the evidence has convinced us that earlier closing would be an immense boon to the shopkeeping community, to shopkeepers and shop assistants alike," that "the present hours are grievously injurious to health, especially in the case of women." The subject is then, I submit, ripe for legislation. Your Lordships have before you two unanimous Resolutions of the House of Commons, one passed only last week, the results of the unanimous Report of your Lordships Committee, Resolutions passed by the Trade Councils of England, Scotland, and Ireland, the support of over 300 tradesmen's associations; and I am satisfied that in passing the Early Closing Bill your Lordships would confer an inestimable boon on the shopkeeping community, would do much to improve the health of our great cities, and to prolong, strengthen, and brighten the lives of many thousands of our countrymen and countrywomen.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a."—(*Lord Avebury.*)

EARL SPENCER: In the interests of equal treatment I beg to move, without further words, the adjournment of the debate.

Moved, "That the debate on the Bill be now adjourned."—(*Earl Spencer*)

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: I do not think the House quite understands the Motion of the noble Earl. I understand that because the House, for certain reasons which were given by the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack, decided to adjourn the discussion of the Bill moved by Lord Ribblesdale, the noble Earl opposite thinks it reasonable to ask the House to adjourn the debate on this Bill without giving any reason whatever. It seems to me that if the noble Earl succeeds in the course he has suggested we shall be placed in a somewhat inconvenient, not to say absurd, position. If the House decides not to proceed with the discussion of Lord Avebury's Bill to-night, I imagine that both Bills will stand in the same position to-morrow, or on whatever day they may be put down for. If this operation was repeated indefinitely, we should thereby be in the position of declining to discuss the subject at all, which I do not suppose is the object of the noble Earl. It seems to me a very extraordinary thing that so much exception should be taken to the House being permitted to express its opinion which of two Bills, on the same subject and of very much the same character, it proposes to take as the subject matter for discussion. Noble Lords opposite seem to think that that is a point which ought to be fairly decided by the position which Bills occupy on the Notice Paper. On the contrary it seems to me a more reasonable proceeding that the House should decide for itself, which of the two Bills should form the basis for discussion. The House has taken one step in the direction of that position by assenting to the adjournment of the discussion on Lord Ribblesdale's Bill, and I hope it will complete the process by refusing to adjourn the discussion on the Bill now before the House.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I think some of the noble Lords present have not taken into their minds the difference between reading two Bills on the same subject and rejecting one of two Bills. What I wished to point out was that Lord Ribblesdale's Bill, as I happened to know, was by many of my friends regarded less favourably than was Lord Avebury's, and would undoubtedly be rejected. Therefore, I desired that Lord Avebury's should be first considered, because, had Lord Ribblesdale's been so rejected, it would have been contrary to order to enter into a discussion of the second Bill at all. I am amazed at the view which has been taken of my action, and that it should be supposed there was any affront intended in the course I took. I could have moved the reference of both Bills to a Committee, but I understood that the noble Lords would have objected to this course. I and a number of my friends would certainly have voted against Lord Ribblesdale's Bill, and under these circumstances I did that which I conceived to be most convenient to the House.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: The speech the Lord Chancellor made in moving the adjournment, which was most unexpected, was to the effect that the past merits of Lord Avebury entitled his Bill to prior consideration. Let me say I can quite understand that point being taken, but I do not think that the method adopted to give effect to the opinion was quite respectful or seemly to the House. I think if the noble and learned Lord had put on the Paper an intimation to the effect that on the Motion for the Second Reading of Lord Ribblesdale's Bill he would move that the House should adjourn the discussion with a view to giving priority to Lord Avebury's Bill, no one would have had any reasonable cause to complain. But what happened? Lord Ribblesdale, in a fluent and picturesque speech, proposed his Bill, and we were prepared to listen with our accustomed eagerness to my noble friend on the Cross Benches, the Earl of Wemyss, who is equally prepared annually to move the rejection of the Bill. In the middle of this, however, the leading authority on order in this House, the Lord Chancellor himself, gets up and moves the adjournment of the debate on the somewhat personal grounds I have stated. I think that *Primâ facie* it would have been more convenient, and possibly more decent, if fair notice had been given that this course was to be taken. The noble Duke takes another line and says—

> "Surely there is nothing more reasonable than that the House should have an opportunity of declaring at once which Bill it prefers."

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: Which Bill it prefers to discuss.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: Since the Motion I notice that there have been reinforcements on the Government side, but the House on a division has only been able to express its passionate wish for the discussion of the second Bill by a majority of two.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: I said nothing about "passion."

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: No, there is no passion in the noble Duke's composition, but I think I have a right to add an epithet to give force to the argument he advanced. I venture to think that the Motion for the adjournment had better not be pressed. Although in my opinion there is no foundation for the doctrine of the noble and learned Lord that the rejection of Lord Ribblesdale's Bill would have prevented our discussing another Bill on the same subject this afternoon, I trust, even if we should be so fortunate as to pass Lord Avebury's Bill, it will not preclude a fair discussion of Lord Ribblesdale's Bill to-morrow.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack said he would have voted against the Bill of my noble friend, Lord Ribblesdale, while he would have voted for Lord Avebury's Bill. Well, my Lords, if the difference between those two Bills is so great, though dealing with the same subject, that the noble and learned Lord is totally unable to support the one while he can give his hearty support to the other, I would submit that the difference is sufficient, even though the first Bill might have been rejected, to allow of a discussion being taken on the second one. I think the noble and learned Lord has proved rather too much in that case. Our only object is to meet the tactics from the Woolsack, with the same tactics in regard to the Bill which is supported by the noble Earl.

EARL SPENCER: I hardly like, after the appeal which has been made to me, to press the Motion which I moved with the object of giving Lord Ribblesdale equal treatment with Lord Avebury. At the same time I strongly desire to protest against the course which was taken by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. I believe it was perfectly unnecessary, and for this reason—that if Lord Avebury, or any other noble Lord, or the Government, disliked the clauses in the Bill of my noble friend, Lord Ribblesdale, they could very properly have amended that Bill, and could have practically transformed it into the second Bill. If the feeling of your Lordships is against my Motion I will not put the House to the trouble of a division.

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I paused before rising to say a few words on this matter under the impression that the noble Earl who had given notice to move the rejection of Lord Ribblesdale's Bill would have taken a similar course with regard to the present Bill, but I am delighted to see that he takes no step to that effect. I do not know in those circumstances that very much need be added to the weighty words which have fallen from the noble Lord, who has for more than a quarter of a century given such close attention and care to this very important subject. As one who sat with him on the Select Committee which considered this question I should like to say one or two words as to the main line of objection which has ordinarily been taken to the measure, and which I understood would have been taken by the noble Earl to-night. We are usually told that this is a Bill which sacrifices the interests of the small shopkeepers to the interests of the great shopkeepers, but I contend that the evidence which has been adduced shows that the opposite is the case. There are no more enthusiastic supporters of this Bill than the mass of small shopkeepers in our great towns. The second class we had to consider were the assistants, on whom, above all others, the benefit will be conferred by the passing of this Bill.

Apart from the paramount question of health, upon which my noble friend dwelt so forcibly, we have the question of the dullness and enforced intellectual poverty of the life to which they are condemned. It is a melancholy fact that the very men and women whom we might expect to find taking advantage of the opportunities for higher education and self-improvement which are now provided in nearly all our great towns are practically precluded by their long hours from doing so. I quite admit that neither the interests of the shopkeepers, large or small, nor the interests of the shop assistants, ought to be allowed to stand in the way if the interests of the public at large are to suffer. We tried in the Select Committee to test, as far as possible, the real opinion of those who would be likely to be most prejudicially affected were such a Bill as this to become law—the general body of purchasers of the poorer classes. Difficult as it is to obtain from this necessarily wholly undefined, unorganised body, any definite expression of opinion, all the steps we took towards obtaining that expression of opinion seemed to show that the grievance, when the Bill is safeguarded in the manner my noble friend proposes, would be reduced to an absolute minimum, and would be insignificant in extent. There would undoubtedly be here and there cases of difficulty and of hardship, but they would be so few and far between that they could not legitimately be allowed to stand in the way of a measure which would, in its general effect, be so beneficial. I most earnestly hope that the House will give a Second Reading to this Bill, which has been so long and carefully considered, and that we may feel that we are taking a step which may lead to its finding a place on the Statute-book before the close of the present Session.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: My Lords, having been a Member of the Select Committee over which the noble Lord presided, I should like to say a few words in support of this Bill. On former occasions, when the Bill has been introduced in your Lordships' House, it has met with some opposition, but on this occasion there has been no word of opposition uttered. We are, therefore, in some difficulty in bringing forward the arguments in favour of it. As a rule, noble Lords in this House have opposed the measure because there is generally a prejudice against compulsory legislation of this character, but, surely, if the Bill is to be a real Bill and to achieve anything at all, it must contain an element of compulsion. I do not think it would be of very great value if it were simply the pious expression of an empty hope. I confess I am in favour of voluntary effort, if you could achieve by voluntary effort the same results as those you seek to achieve by legislation, but this Bill owes its very existence to the fact that the voluntary effort among the shopkeeping community, in the direction of the earlier closing of shops, has completely and hopelessly broken down. The history of the movement, and of its failure, is a long and almost pathetic one. There is a mass of evidence from all parts of the country showing the failure of the voluntary effort, which has not broken down because shopkeepers themselves are opposed to it, not because there is any reasonable minority of shopkeepers who decline to allow the majority to impose their wishes upon them, but it has broken down simply and solely because an insignificant number of shopkeepers have been able to render the voluntary effort of the majority of no avail.

It is true that in this Bill there is a certain element of compulsion, but I trust your Lordships will recognise how limited that compulsion is. It is proposed that a two-thirds majority of the shopkeepers in a locality can approach the local authority for power to close their shops at a certain hour. The draft order of the local authority requires the sanction of the central authority, and that, in its turn, requires the approval of Parliament. Your Lordships will therefore see that we do not aim at imposing a check on the freedom of individuals. We do not desire to enforce a series of restrictions on shopkeepers, nor to interfere with their private enterprise. The principle of this Bill is based less upon a system of compulsion than of making the existing voluntary effort effective. It has been urged on former occasions in this House that the labouring classes are opposed to this measure, and that, if it became law, great injury would be inflicted on the working classes who desired to shop late at night, between, say, the hours of nine and eleven. If that were so, I admit it would be a weighty consideration, and it is possible to get evidence in support of either side. I suppose there never was a Committee, either of this House or the House of Commons, who did not have to take conflicting evidence into consideration. What I do ask your Lordships to do on the present occasion is to look at this matter in its broad and general outline. If the working classes were opposed to this measure, surely their protests would have been heard before now from the labour Members in the House of Commons. But I think I am right in saying that the labour Members have spoken in favour of the general principle of the Bill, and have given their support to it. Again, if this Bill was at all injurious to the working classes, we should have had a strong protest before now from the Trade Unionists, who are giving the measure their support. Finally, if the artizan class were opposed to the measure, and thought that any injury was likely to be inflicted on them by it, we should have had meetings of protest in all the large towns. On the other hand, meetings have been held in Liverpool, Glasgow, Manchester, Birmingham, Bristol, and other centres, not against this measure, but in favour of it. I do not share the apprehensions that I have heard expressed, not in this House, but outside, that a measure of this kind would be difficult to enforce. Your Lordships will remember the Act regulating the hours of labour of children in shops. I believe I am right in saying that, two years after the passing of that Act, there were hardly any people who had to be prosecuted for violating it.

I should like for a moment to deal with some of the principles which underlie this Bill. We have generally been told that this is grandmotherly legislation, and I daresay there are some noble Lords who think that the freedom of the individual is being interfered with. I hope your Lordships will notice how carefully that interference is restricted and limited, and, I may say, that we justify that experience on the one ground of health. Lord Beaconsfield laid it down that it was the duty of the Government to safeguard the health of the nation, and I contend that we are entitled to interfere with the liberty of the subject to the small extent proposed, in order to safeguard the health of the shopkeeping community, who are seriously affected by the present state of things. The Committee of the House of Commons which sat in 1888 on the subject of the regulation of shop hours, received medical testimony that the effect of long hours on health was most deplorable. It is a long story of suffering and misery. The medical witnesses stated that the health of females deteriorated to a degree lamentable to themselves and disastrous to their offspring. In the case of men, consumption and other diseases are produced, and the late Sir William M'Cormack stated before our Committee that the long hours in shops promoted disease in an accumulative degree. I do not believe there are any noble Lords who would urge that the effects and the strain of excessive toil are insignificant compared with the slight interference that would result from the passing of this Bill.

I think there is a greater consideration. Can the State afford to become wealthy if, by so doing, it diminishes the vigour and stamina of its citizens? I can well understand noble Lords who say that it is a cruel thing to limit the right of an individual to work to his utmost capacity for his own support, and for the support of those dependent upon him. When that toil is healthy, when it is in the open air, when the resulting strain is distributed throughout the body, I should not advocate interference. But in the case of those industries with which this measure proposes to deal, where the work is often performed under unhealthy circumstances, and in unwholesome surroundings, the case is very different. I claim that there is here a legitimate field for your Lordships' intervention. Those of us who are deeply interested in this measure, and believe in its beneficial effect, claim on its behalf that it will ultimately remove a great evil which now exists among the shopkeeping community; that shoppeople themselves will welcome it; that it will not be difficult to enforce, and that only a small pinch of compulsion is required to render effective the vast volume of voluntary effort. It is not within the power of Parliament directly to grant the people of this country either health, wisdom, or strength, but it is within our power, and I think I may say within our duty, to encourage and foster those tendencies which make for a better state of things, and to retard those influences which are most harmful and wasteful; it is in the belief that the Bill of my noble friend will in no small degree promote the health of the shopkeeping community, that I for one desire to give it my wholehearted and unstinted support.

LORD BELPER: My Lords, I think before the debate closes I ought to say a few words on behalf of the Government. After the very general assent which has been given to the principle of this Bill to-night, I do not think I need go into any of its details. The House will remember that on the last occasion when my noble friend Lord Avebury brought forward a Bill on this subject, it was my duty to say, on behalf of the Government, that they could not accept it because it did not contain provisions carrying out the recommendation of the Committee for the control of Parliament. That is not the case in the present Bill. The noble Lord has, I think, done his best to carry out the recommendations of the Committee, and it would have been a great misfortune if by any procedure to-night we had been deprived of having the Bill explained to us by Lord Avebury. He has taken such an active part in this matter in the past, that really the position the Bill now holds in Parliament is due in a great measure to his energy; and he has this advantage, that he represents the feelings, the views, and the wishes of the shopkeeping class themselves. In addition, he has given attention to the objections that have been raised in some quarters, and in the Bill now presented has done everything possible to prevent any inconvenience or difficulty arising.

With regard to the Bill itself, the Home Office certainly like the provisions in this Bill better than those in Lord

Ribblesdale's—and for this reason, that Lord Avebury's Bill goes more fully into detail with regard to the regulations that the local authority have to make. I have not the least intention of trespassing upon the time of the House by alluding to a Bill which is not before us, but I must emphasise the fact that the regulations contained in Lord Avebury's Bill are of very great value. The local authority cannot act at all unless, in the first place, the initiative is taken by some of those who are interested, and they cannot act unless an application is made to the Council. Then, again, they can take no action unless at least two-thirds of the shopkeepers affected approve of the application, and, after holding an enquiry and satisfying themselves that it is desirable to make an Order, there is a further safeguard, because after they have made a Draft Order, that Order goes to the central authority for consideration. The central authority is not allowed to take any action on the Draft Order unless it has been published for a certain time, and they are bound to consider any objections to it. I know that in some quarters exception has been taken to this procedure, whereby the central authority does not actually make the Provisional Order, as suggested by the Committee. But I think your Lordships will see that the action that has to be taken by the Home Office—and it is the central authority, very properly, under this Bill—is of such a character as practically to carry out the spirit, and I believe even the letter, of the Committee's proposal. The procedure is that the Home Office shall, if they approve of the Draft Order, lay it on the Table of Parliament, and after lying on the Table for forty days, it shall take effect unless any objection is raised to it. I think that practically carries out the proposal of the Committee that the Order should be submitted to Parliament, and should not be operative unless it had the approval of Parliament. I will not detain your Lordships by saying anything with regard to the other provisions of the Bill. I would only add that if the Bill goes forward, as I hope it will, to Committee, there may be Amendments which it may be necessary for the Home Office to introduce. On behalf of the Government, I have to say that they give their approval to the Bill, and believe it will form a reasonable basis for the settlement of this question.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, I do not wish to detain your Lordships at any length, especially as the fate of this Bill has now been decided by the speech of my noble friend Lord Belper. Without the assistance of the noble Earl on the Cross Benches, the Government have now got rid of the first Bill on the Order Paper and have declared themselves in favour of the second Bill. Although I have a great deal to say upon the merits and the details of Lord Avebury's Bill, I shall reserve that for a future occasion; but I would just like to state that I regard the Bill at the present moment as entirely unsatisfactory in its scope, and as going not nearly far enough to satisfy the demands of the country. The noble Duke who spoke just now declared that the Bill had the support of the Trades Unions and of the representatives of the working classes in the House of Commons, but I would point out that the Bill which has that support, and has it in a larger extent, is a very much stronger Bill than either of the two produced to-day. I hope the Bill will be very considerably strengthened in Committee, and I trust that the Amendments which the noble Lord referred to just now on the part of the Home Office will take that form. Otherwise I do not believe it will have the slightest chance of passing the House of Commons.

I would remind your Lordships of the fact that we have just had another by-election. I saw the result of that by-election hawked about the streets this morning as the knell of the Government. What is the meaning of that election? Do your Lordships suppose that the working men of Woolwich returned Mr. Crooks to Parliament in order to tell His Majesty's Ministers that they are over-legislated for, that they are over-governed? I do not believe it for a moment. They sent Mr. Crooks to Parliament in order to tell His Majesty's Ministers that they want a more active interest taken in their affairs. They do not want to be left alone, but want the Government to take effective steps in order to improve their condition: and I think that if the policy of mere "let alone," the policy of administrative Nihilism, is continued by every Department of the Government, it will be impossible for us to remain for long in that position of commercial supremacy of which we are so proud, for the industrial strength of this country never can rest upon the weakness and the degradation of the working classes. I will postpone what I have to say on the merits of the Bill, but I trust when we come to discuss the Bill in Committee, the Amendments will take the form of putting some strength into it.

On Question, agreed to; Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

House adjourned at half-past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 12th March, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

CROYDON AND DISTRICT ELECTRIC TRAMWAYS BILL.

"To authorise the British Electric Traction Company (Limited) to construct further tramways in the counties of London, Surrey, and Kent; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

WIGAN CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

"To confer further powers upon the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Wigan in regard to the construction of tramways and street improvements; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

HARROW ROAD AND PADDINGTON TRAMWAYS BILL.

"To empower the Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Company to construct new tramways; to work their tramways by mechanical power; to lease their undertaking to the Metropolitan Electric Tramways, Limited; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

SHEFFIELD CORPORATION BILL.

"To confer further powers on the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the city of Sheffield with respect to their water undertaking and their electrical undertaking; to authorise the construction of additional lines of tramways, and the execution of various street widenings and other works in the city; to consolidate into one township certain townships in the city; to make further and better provision for the improvement, health, and good government of the city; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

LANARKSHIRE AND DUMBARTONSHIRE RAILWAY BILL.

"To authorise the Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway Company to raise further moneys; to enable the Caledonian Railway Company to subscribe for additional shares or stock; to sanction certain existing railways; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT RAILWAY (VARIOUS POWERS) BILL.

"To empower the Metropolitan District Railway Company to deviate the railway authorised by The Metropolitan District Railway Act, 1897, and to construct other railways; to acquire lands; to lay down electric cables; to raise further capital; to acquire the Hounslow and Metropolitan Railway; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Hull; and Kent; to lie upon the Table.

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Selkirk; and Lethnot; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING (SCOTLAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petitions against: from Stockton; Wickham; and Blaydon; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2942 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE (FOREIGN COUNTRIES) (MISCELLANEOUS, No. 1, 1903).

Copy presented, of Reports on the laws on marriage and divorce in foreign countries (in continuation of Miscellaneous, No. 2, 1894) [by Command] to lie upon the Table.

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House—

Inquiry into Charities (County of Lancashire), further Return relative thereto [ordered 8th August, 1898; *Mr. Grant Lawson*] to be printed [No. 72].

RAILWAYS, ETC., BILLS.

Return ordered, "of Report by the Board of Trade upon all the Railway, Canal, Tramway, Harbour and Tidal Waters, Electricity, Gas, and Water Bills, and Provisional Orders of Session 1903."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

MILITARY EXPEDITIONS.

Address for "Return of all Military Expeditions in which British or Native troops have been employed during the last ten years, in the following form:—

Year.	Expedition.	Troops employed.		Duration.	Cost.
		British.	Native.		

—(*Mr. Charles Hobhouse.*)

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had added to the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice and Legal Procedure the following fifteen Members in respect of the Incest Bill:—Colonel Blundell, Sir John Brunner, Mr. Burt, Mr. Charles Douglas, Sir Samuel Hoare, Mr. Joseph Howard, Sir John Kennaway, Colonel Lockwood Mr. Nussey, Mr. Perks, Mr. Pym, Mr. Talbot, Mr. Tritton, Mr. George White, and Mr. Henry Joseph Wilson.

Report to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Traction Engines—Accidents in London Streets.

MR. C. E. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many accidents have been reported to him by the police as caused by the traction engines and wagons employed by the contractor to the Great Northern, Brompton, and Piccadilly Electric Railway, now in course of construction; what is the nature of the accidents, and at what hour of the day did they occur; do the police report upon the absence of any man with a red danger flag going before these traction engines to give warning.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*) Three accidents are reported to me as having been caused by horses taking fright at the traction engine in question. In one case, which occurred at 11.30 a.m., a hackney carriage was overturned, and the driver's arm and the hands of a gentleman in the cab were injured. In the second, which occurred at 6.15 p.m., a van collided with the engine, and the driver of the van was cut about the head and sustained concussion of the brain. In the third case, which occurred at 1.30 p.m., a brougham collided with a hackney carriage, and the driver of the brougham was thrown into the roadway and died of his injuries. Reports also show that in three other instances the engine skidded or collided with an electric wire post and an electric tramcar. In one case a man employed with the engine was injured. There is no statutory requirement that a man should carry a red flag in front of such engines. I may add that I am informed that the use of the traction engine has been discontinued by the contractor.

Rights of Property in India—Religious Disabilities.

Sir HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for India if his attention has been called to a decision of the Chief Court of Mysore, in the case of Dasappa *v.* Chikkamma, in which a convert to Christianity was, by reason of his change of faith, deprived of the right of guardianship over his children and of other civil rights; whether the Durbar intimated their readiness to remove by legislation these disabilities so far as they relate to rights of property; and whether any steps have been taken with respect to this legislation.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) I am aware of the case referred to by my right hon. friend, which occurred in 1895, but my attention has not been called to any cases of similar hardship as having arisen since then. The Mysore Government have recognised that some action towards reducing the disabilities of converts from Hinduism is both equitable and necessary, but have added that "the exact point at which legislation ought to stop, and to what conditions and limitations the rules of inheritance of the Hindu Law when relaxed should be subjected, so as to prevent coparceners remaining in the religion of their birth from avoidable and vexatious interference and annoyance, requires most careful consideration." The Durbar, I understand, has the question still under consideration. Having regard to the views which they have expressed and to the fact that the Maharaja has only recently succeeded to administrative powers, I think that the matter may be left to the Mysore Government. I may add that the India Act XXI. of 1850 has been applied to the station at Bangalore.

Allied Forces in China—International Medal.

Mr. KEARLEY (Devonport): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the project of granting an international decoration to the troops of the various nations who took part in the operations in China is still under consideration, and when a decision is likely to be arrived at.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) His Majesty's Government had at one time under their consideration, in consultation with other Powers, the question of bestowing an international medal upon those who took part in the defence of the Legations at Pekin. This medal was not in any way to take the place of such medals or decorations as each State might think well to confer upon its own nationals. In consequence, however, of an absence of unanimity among the Powers concerned, it was finally decided to abandon the proposal.

Excise Duties on Indian Cotton.

Sir WILLIAM HOLLAND (Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will take into consideration the question of repealing the Excise duties on the production of Indian cotton mills, together with the corresponding import duties, as soon as the state of the Indian Exchequer will warrant his doing so.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) I cannot hold out any hope at present of reducing the Customs duties now in force in India.

Elementary School at Mydrim, Carmarthenshire—Payment of Grant.

Mr. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he is aware that no Government grant has been paid in respect of the elementary school at Mydrim, Carmarthenshire, since last May, and that the school is only kept open by the teachers on their own responsibility; and whether he will state what steps should be taken in order to secure the annual Government grant.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) As the hon. Member is doubtless aware, the managers of the Mydrim School declared that they were unable to continue the school after 30th May last, and it was accordingly removed from the Annual Grant List. The Board understand that since that date the school has been conducted as a private adventure school by the headmaster. The trustees, or any other responsible body of managers, are at liberty to re-open the school as a public elementary school, and to make applications for its being again placed on the Annual Grant List. But the conditions of the Code as sanctioned by Parliament make it impossible for the Board of Education to pay grants in respect of a school carried on as a private adventure school.

Cleaning of the Serpentine.

MR. BULL (Hammersmith): To ask the hon. Member for North Hunts, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether, having regard to the fact that the Serpentine has not been cleaned out since 1871, he will consider the desirability of having this done at an early date in the interest of bathers and swimmers.

(*Answered by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.*) His Majesty's Government regret that they are unable to give any assurance in this matter; the task of cleaning out the Serpentine would be very costly and would occupy a very long time. There have been no complaints from bathers.

Improved Postal Facilities at Devonport.

MR. KEARLEY: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is now able to announce his decision as to the request of the inhabitants for improved telegraph facilities in the Keyham Barton district of Devonport.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I wrote to the hon. Member on the day before his Question appeared in the Paper and explained to him the reasons why I did not feel justified in establishing a telegraph office at Keyham Barton.

Liverpool Post Office—Salaries of Female Staff.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): To ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that the maximum salary of the female supervisors at the counter offices in Liverpool, who occupy positions involving heavy responsibilities, is £30 less than the maximum salary of the ordinary male counter clerks, and that the female counter staff in Liverpool, whose duties include monetary responsibilities and consequent risk of loss, are paid upon the same scale as officers who are employed entirely in the telegraph department and have no such responsibilities and risks; and will he say whether he proposes to take any, and if so what, steps to remedy this alleged grievance.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) As I informed the hon. Member in this House in December,† it has repeatedly been decided by my predecessors that the salary of the female supervising officers is sufficient for the duties performed, and I have not yet been able to come to a conclusion on the reconsideration of the matter which I then promised. I hope, however, shortly to be in a position to announce my decision to the officers concerned.

Members of Parliament and Postal Servants.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: To ask the Postmaster-General whether the members of the postal telegraph service are permitted to approach Members of Parliament with reference to matters affecting their conditions of service; whether the men or their representatives have the right to place copies of the correspondence between the aggrieved persons and their official heads in the hands of Members of Parliament.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The rule applicable to this matter is as follows:—" A postmaster is to address to his surveyor, and a subordinate officer is to address to the postmaster (who will forward it to his surveyor), any application from himself having reference to his duties or pay, or any communication he may desire to make relating to official matters; and if the applicant is dissatisfied with the result he may appeal direct to the Postmaster-General. But it is strictly forbidden to make any such application or other communication through the public, or to procure one to be made by Members of Parliament or others; and, should an irregular application be received, the officer on whose behalf it is made will be subject to censure or punishment proportionate to the extent of his participation in the violation of the rule." But it has been my practice to treat the rule as applying only to applications so made in the first instance, and I have raised no objection to an officer who had appealed to me, and was dissatisfied with my decision, applying subsequently to a Member of Parliament. But official correspondence between officers of the Department must not be made public without the Postmaster-General's assent being first asked and obtained.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxv., 839.

Sunday Delivery of Letters in Kilkenny.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the service of letters between Johnstown, Galmoy, Crosspatrick, and Garrybaun districts of the county Kilkenny is not supplied on Sundays; and whether, in view of the convenience to the trading interests of these places, and seeing that there is a letter carrier engaged for six days of the week conveying the mails to and from the existing sub-offices at Galmoy and Crosspatrick, he can arrange that one delivery and one collection shall also be made on Sunday.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I will make inquiry as to the possibility of providing a Sunday delivery and collection of letters at the places in county Kilkenny referred to by the hon. Member; and I will communicate the result to him as soon as possible.

International Conference on Fishing Rights.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the Dutch Government some four years ago brought to the notice of His Majesty's Government certain resolutions passed by the Institute of International Law, and confirmed by the International Law Association, of which the Lord Chief Justice is president, and proposed to call a conference of European Powers to reconsider the existing rules applicable to the limits of territorial waters for fishing purposes, and, seeing it was owing to the refusal of His Majesty's Government to take part in it that the conference fell through, whether he will now reconsider the advisability of promoting this conference.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) No such proposals were made at the time mentioned. But in 1895 the Dutch Government consulted Great Britain and other maritime Powers on the expediency of calling together a conference for the purpose of determining in a uniform manner for all nations the distance of the limit of territorial waters from the shore. The limit was to be discussed only with reference to fisheries. His Majesty's Government, and, we believe, other Governments concerned, were of opinion that no advantage would be gained by opening such a discussion, and, as far as I am aware, nothing has since occurred to modify that opinion.

Surveyors of Taxes—Clerical Assistance.

MR. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will consider the possibility of placing some of the clerks to the surveyors of taxes at the disposal of the chief inspector of taxes in England for temporary assistance in the offices of surveyors where there is a pressure of work, having regard to the fact that the inspectors of taxes in Scotland and Ireland have at their disposal for emergencies experienced clerks of this character, while the relief given in England is by the temporary engagement of inexperienced men who can render no real assistance.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) In cases where expert assistance is required to meet temporary pressure of work in a surveyor's office, such assistance is provided by sending out a surveyor from the head office staff. It is not considered either necessary or desirable to adopt the arrangement suggested by the hon. Member. It is not the fact that such an arrangement exists in Scotland or Ireland.

Assistant Teachers in Ireland—Teaching of Irish.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, if an assistant teacher give instruction in Irish during the year, his or her name must necessarily be returned at the end of the year, *i.e.*, at the annual examination, as having taught such subject; and whether the Commissioners will insist on the name of every teacher who gives instruction in any extra subject in a national school being returned on the yearly returns as having taught such subjects during the year.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I am informed that the name of every teacher who gives instruction in a national school must be submitted to the Commissioners for approval, and should appear on the yearly returns from each school. There is a special form of report for extra subjects showing the name of the person or persons giving the instruction, and of the pupils receiving instruction.

Erection of Labourers' Cottages in the Listowel Union.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Local Government Board have sanctioned in 1901 the erection of six labourers' cottages in the Tarbert electoral division of the Listowel Union; and, if so, will he explain why those cottages have not been built or the plots of land given to the labourers.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Local Government Board by Provisional Order dated 10th May, 1901, authorised the District Council to erect one cottage and to provide seven additional half-acre plots for cottages already built in this electoral division. The arbitrator's award fixing the compensation to be paid for the lands was completed in June last. The carrying into execution of the scheme sanctioned by the Board and of putting the labourers into possession of the plots is entirely a matter for the District Council.

Ireland—Local Government Audits—St. Patrick's Day.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Local Government Board auditors have sent notices of audit to the Killarney Urban Council, the Kanturk Rural Council, and other places, for St. Patrick's Day; and if he will give instructions to have all audits fixed for this day postponed.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) It is not proposed to hold any audits on the date mentioned.

Labourers' (Ireland) Act.—Return.

MR. MURPHY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is prepared to grant the Return in reference to the Labourers' Acts standing on the Paper.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I am quite prepared to grant a Return. In its present form, however, it is open to improvement. The alterations that I suggest, and which I have communicated to the hon. Member, will, I think, commend themselves to his colleague in whose name the Return stands.

Military Education—Promotion of Non-commissioned Officers to Commissioned Rank.

MR. RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth): To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether, in drawing up regulations dealing with the future education of officers in His Majesty's Army, he will consider the possibility of including a provision by which a non-commissioned officer who qualifies himself may attain commissioned rank.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The promotion of non-commissioned officers to commissioned rank is already fully provided for in the regulations. The question of the relation between the future education of officers and the qualifications necessary for promotion from the ranks will not be lost sight of.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Mock Courts-Martial in the Grenadier Guards.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he will agree to the appointment of a Committee of this House to inquire into the practices which have obtained in the Grenadier Guards in respect to mock Courts-martial by and on officers, and the punishments inflicted, with a view to elucidate what officers have been responsible for such practices; and whether anything of a like nature has existed in other regiments.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The matters referred to have been dealt with by the Commander-in-Chief, and I cannot for a moment consent to interfere with his authority in the direction suggested by the hon. Member. I have no information in regard to mock Courts-martial in other regiments, with the exception of one case, which is now the subject of investigation.

MR. LABOUCHERE: Will the right hon. Gentleman, if he will not agree to give this Committee, lay on the Table of the House the evidence before the Court of Inquiry, which he promised to do if he were asked for it? I ask for it.

MR. BRODRICK: I went as far as to say that of course I should lay on the Table of the House, in any case, the evidence of Colonel Kinloch, which I quoted last night. I also said I would, if I were pressed for it, lay the whole of the evidence on the Table. But, at the same time, I would strongly appeal to the House not to insist on this very unusual course. I believe there is no precedent for laying on the Table the evidence of a regimental inquiry of this character; and, unless there is a belief that substantial injustice has been done, I do not think the House will press for it.

MR. LABOUCHERE: Will the Prime Minister tell me whether he can give me a day to press the Secretary of State for War?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The hon. Gentleman can, of course, resort to the ballot in the ordinary way.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): On a point of order I desire to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether a Minister, having quoted from a document as to which he is not prepared to say it would be contrary to the public interest to lay it upon the Table of the House, is not bound, at the request of any hon. Member, to lay it on the Table.

MR. BRODRICK: On the point of order, I would submit to you, Sir, that I have proposed to, and shall, lay on the Table the document to which my hon. friend alludes — namely, the evidence which I quoted.

*MR. SPEAKER: I have nothing to add to what I stated in answer to the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich yesterday evening. That was, I believe, a correct statement.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Is it not the rule when a correspondence is referred to, to lay on the Table the whole of the correspondence. Are there not precedents which govern that the document from which the right hon. Gentleman quoted was part and parcel of the correspondence?

*MR. SPEAKER: There have been cases; and it is perfectly correct to say that when a Minister does quote part of a document he may be called upon to lay on the Table the whole of that document. I also stated last night that that was subject to this provision—that if the Minister stated that it was contrary to the public interest that the Paper should be disclosed, he is at liberty to say so, and he takes the responsibility upon himself.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeenshire, N.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, in view of the grave injury which will ensue to military discipline from the publication of the documents, he will reconsider his decision not to grant a Court-martial in this case?

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: On the point of order, Sir, am I to understand that when you said document you meant the whole of the correspondence germane to the question, and not merely a single document?

*Mr. SPEAKER: I never said anything so vague as that.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: Does the right hon. Gentleman say that he declines to lay on the Table the whole of this evidence on the ground that it is contrary to the public interest?

Mr. BRODRICK: I cannot actually say that it will be contrary to the public interest, but I say it is contrary to precedent, that, in my opinion, it is also entirely subversive of the interests of discipline to lay details of discipline cases before the House. May I be allowed to explain? My point is this. Nobody alleges that there was intention on the part of the Commander-in-Chief either not to protect these subalterns or to prevent the recurrence of the same chain of circumstances. Under these circumstances the mere revelation of a number of names and incidents, to which a great deal too much importance has been attached, would be, I think, highly undesirable. I have not the slightest desire to conceal anything. So far as the War Office is concerned there is nothing which cannot be published to-morrow; but I would appeal to the hon. Member and to the House not to press for a course which would be very unusual. In reply to the hon. Member for North Aberdeen I can assure him that, the Commander-in-Chief having dealt with this matter of discipline fully, and no doubt effectively as an example to all, I shall certainly not accept the idea of a Court-martial.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: I have to ask you, Sir, whether, as the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War says he is not prepared to say that it is contrary to the public interest that this evidence should be submitted to the House, he is not bound, by your explanation of the rule, to lay it before the House?

*Mr. SPEAKER: I hardly understood precisely what the right hon. Gentleman did say on that point. I understood him to say he considered it would be subversive of military discipline; but whether he considers, in saying that, that it would not be in the public interest I do not know. The responsibility of whether it is contrary to the public interest or not must be on him and not on me.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: I would call your attention to the fact that, unless I am very much mistaken, the right hon. Gentleman himself said that he could not say that it was contrary to the public interest.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I did not gather that those were his words. Of course, if that is so, I think he is bound to lay the document on the Table.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: Am I not right in saying that the right hon. Gentleman said he could not say that it was not in the public interest?

Mr. BRODRICK: I certainly drew a distinction between what might be considered in the public interest and the interests of the discipline of the Army. I certainly think that anything which tends to interfere with the authority of the Commander-in-Chief is contrary to the discipline of the Army, and in that sense, of course, it is contrary to the public interest. May I be allowed to say that the publication of the evidence of one officer, whose conduct has been brought before the House, does in no sense involve the publication of the evidence of a number of other officers whose conduct has not been brought before the House? It would be only similar to what has been done in many other cases—namely, to publish an individual letter or despatch without publishing the whole of the correspondence relating to it.

The Flogging of Two Drummer Boys.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in reference to his statement last night as to a breach of the King's Regulations, in the flogging of two drummer boys, he will place on the Table of the House the evidence in regard to that transaction.

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir, I have given my own statement as to a matter of fact, and I see no reason whatever for laying the Papers on the Table of the House.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman grant me the return as to flogging which I have put on the Paper?

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir, I cannot in its present form.

Boer Prisoners of War—Colonial Control.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War under what authority, statutory or otherwise, have Boers taken prisoner in the late war, who have been deported to India, Ceylon, or Bermuda, been detained in imprisonment, and in many instances treated as common criminals, for nearly a twelvemonth after the conclusion of the peace.

The hon. Member had the following Questions down on the same subject:—

To ask the Secretary of State for War how many Boer prisoners of war are at present detained in Bermuda, and under what circumstances are they now detained, and when will they be sent back to South Africa.

To ask the Secretary of State for War at what stations in India are Boers, who have been taken prisoners in the late war, imprisoned at the present time, and what are the numbers of the Boers detained at each station; by whose authority, and on whose responsibility, was a communication made to Boers thus imprisoned that default in taking the oath of allegiance would prolong their stay in the hotter districts, whereas the taking by them of that oath would secure their removal to cool hill stations; and what course does the War Office intend to take with reference to these prisoners.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E., for MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN): Perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to answer these Questions.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: No, Sir, I will not.

*MR. SPEAKER: Then do I understand it is not the intention of the hon. Member to put these questions?

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Yes, Sir, I put them to the Secretary for War. This is a matter for personal explanation. The Postmaster-General is no doubt willing to answer, but I decline to allow him because I have received, and I have in my possession, a letter from the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War promising me that he would answer these three questions to-day.

MR. BRODRICK: My reply is that the whole matter was handed over to the Colonial Office in June last, and, therefore, the hon. Member must address his Questions to my right hon. friend.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Why did you send me a letter saying that you would answer these questions to-day?

MR. BRODRICK: I said I was willing to give an answer to a question you asked me, that question being whether I would reply to these questions.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: And now you decline to reply to them.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The right hon. Gentleman has stated that these are matters for the Colonial Office, and, therefore, the hon. Member must address them to that Department.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Now I want to ask the Secretary for War a question, of which I have given him private notice. It is: Whether the control and treatment of the Boers who were taken prisoners in the late war, and who have been deported to India, Ceylon, and the Bermudas, and detained there notwithstanding the conclusion of the war and the proclamation of peace, are within the purview of the War Office, and within his sphere as Minister for War.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is merely carrying on a debate as to whether these questions should be dealt with by the War Office or the Colonial Office. He has been told that the Colonial Office deals with them, and I think he is now carrying the privilege of putting supplementary questions too far. If he wishes to make any more inquiries he must put his question down.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I can only say that I put my question to the right hon. Gentleman in accordance with a request which he made to me. The hon. Member proposed to address the questions to the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster-General, but he had left the House.

Somaliland Campaign.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the fact that an object of the movements in Somaliland is to give a prominent share in the campaign to the Somali levies, who are stated to be without courage, and who require the severest disciplinary measures; and what further information he can give on the subject.

MR. BRODRICK: There is no foundation whatever for the statement that the Somali levies are to be given a prominent share in the campaign. There are none employed in General Manning's column. The only Somalis now employed belong to the permanent local battalion of King's African Rifles, and have been left under the orders of the officer commanding the lines of communication in the Protectorate.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say what this war is all about?

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: They cannot.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

The Lancers—Prizes for Lance Practice.

*COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the prizes for good lance practice now awarded annually to the non-commissioned officers and men of Lancer regiments are to be discontinued.

MR. BRODRICK: At the time when the extra service pay of sixpence a day was sanctioned it was determined to treat twopence of this pay as the reward of increased efficiency in shooting, gunnery, or skill in lance practice, etc.; consequently special prizes will not be given for these services.

Lance v. Sword.

*COLONEL LEGGE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will reconsider the question of regiments of Lancers, Dragoon Guards, and Dragoons retaining the lance for active service and ceasing to carry the sword.

MR. BRODRICK: This question has been very thoroughly considered by the military authorities, and it would be impossible for me to reopen the decision come to entirely on military grounds.

MAJOR WYNDHAM QUIN (Glamorganshire, S.) was understood to ask if the Order had been issued with the approval of the new Inspector-General of Cavalry.

MR. BRODRICK: It is most unusual to ask in this House as to what special officer has been cognisant of a particular Order; and I may say, in reply to my hon. and gallant friend, that an entirely erroneous impression was produced on the House the other day by a statement to that effect with regard to the Inspector-General of Auxiliary forces. I have not the sightest doubt that the Inspector-General of Cavalry was fully consulted in this matter.

Marine Engineering Committee.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty can he state the names of the members of the Committee of the highest recognised authorities in the country appointed to assist the Board of

Admiralty in dealing with the problems of marine engineering; in what respect does the equipment of the Board require strengthening for this purpose; and how will the exercise of its functions by this Committee affect the action and the responsibility of the Engineer-in-Chief.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The Committee to which my hon. friend refers has not yet been appointed, and no steps will be taken to constitute it until the present Boiler Committee has completed its inquiries. It is believed that it will be an advantage to the Admiralty to obtain the advice of a Committee composed of the highest engineering authorities in the country on such questions as may be referred to it. It is hoped that the Committee will render to the engineering branch of the Navy services similar to those which have been rendered with great advantage by Sir Frederick Bramwell and Sir Benjamin Baker to the Ordnance Branch. The appointment of the Committee will not in any way diminish the responsibility of the Engineer-in-Chief.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Can the hon. Gentleman say when the Committee will be appointed?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, I cannot.

Lord Goschen's Committee.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what are the steps which the Board of Admiralty have already taken to remedy the absence from the *Flag List* of a due proportion of younger officers; have these steps been taken in pursuance of the recommendations of the Committee presided over by Lord Goschen; and will he either lay upon the Table the Report of that Committee or the recommendations embodied therein; if so, will he do this before the discussion on the Navy Estimates.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Report of Lord Goschen's Committee has not yet been fully considered by the Board of Admiralty. It is not, however, proposed to lay the Report upon the Table. Steps have already been taken by the Admiralty to remedy the absence from the *Flag List* of a due proportion of younger officers. A certain number of young officers have been added both to the captains' and commanders' lists, and will thus reach flag rank at an earlier age than has lately been usual.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Am I to understand that steps have been taken before the Report of the Committee has been fully considered?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Steps have been taken, but that does not preclude any further steps being taken if it is thought desirable.

Increase of the Fleet—Committee.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, will he state names of the members of the Committee which reported, in 1902, on the increase of the Fleet in commission and reserve in home waters and the consequent congestion of accommodation; and will he lay their Report on the Table, or state its purport before the discussion on the Navy Estimates; and was the selection of the Firth of Forth for the establishment of a Naval base and depôt recommended by that Committee in preference to other available sites.

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The Committee consisted of Sir William Wharton (hydrographer), Sir James Williamson (Director of Dockyards), Captain G. Patey, R.N. (Assistant Director of Naval Intelligence), Colonel E. Raban (Director of Works), and myself. The Report, which contains other matter than that referred to in the Question, much of which is of a confidential nature, cannot in any case be laid upon the Table of the House before the discussion on the Navy Estimates. Before the introduction of the Naval Works Bill a decision will be arrived at whether this can be done, but no pledge can be given on the subject. The answer to the second paragraph of the Question is "Yes."

Conveyance of Stores to South Africa—Wages of Sailors and Firemen.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Postmaster General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether his attention has been directed to the fact that His Majesty's Government is negotiating contracts for the conveyance of stores to South Africa by vessels owned by companies that are paying wages below the standard rate for sailors and firemen; and whether, in view of the Fair Wages Resolution of this House, and of the fact that numbers of British seamen who rendered service during the recent war in South Africa are unable to obtain employment on British ships, he can take any steps to secure that such men should receive employment in preference to foreigners.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: If the hon. Member refers to shipments by His Majesty's Government this Question should be addressed to the Parliamentary Secretary of the Admiralty; but if he alludes, as I presume he does, to the shipment of stores for the Governments of the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony and for the Central South African Railways, I would point out that any contracts which the Crown agents for the colonies might take for these purposes would not come within the scope of the Resolution of this House to which he refers, and I regret that it is not possible, in the arrangements to which the hon. Member refers, to secure the objects which he has in view.

Labour Ordinances in the Transvaal.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I beg to ask the Postmaster General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether he will lay upon the Table a copy of the various ordinances of the late Boer Government in respect to black and white labour in the Transvaal, all changes and new regulations that have been made in these ordinances since the annexation of the Transvaal, and all correspondence on the subject between the Transvaal Government and the Johannesburg Chamber of Mines, or any other persons purporting to be the representatives of the mine owners.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (for Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN): Several of the more important enactments have already been included in the Parliamentary Papers Command 714 and Command 904. I could not undertake to lay all the various Papers asked for, but the laws and proclamations of the Transvaal have been placed in the Library. I have no knowledge of any correspondence of the nature referred to.

In reply to a further Question by Mr. LABOUCHERE,

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he believed the Command Papers referred to contained all the more important ordinances.

India—Water Storage and Irrigation Commission.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the Commission, of which Sir C. Scott-Moncrieff is Chairman, appointed by Lord Curzon in 1901 to investigate projects for water storage and irrigation throughout India, began its labours in the latter part of that year, and that evidence was given before it in that year in Northern Guzerat describing several projects for water storage in that province; whether any of these works have yet been put in hand; and, if not, whether the Bombay Government can be empowered to undertake them forthwith, so that the rains and surplus floods of the next monsoon may be saved during the current year; and whether any communications that may have been received from Lord Northcote's Government on this subject will be placed before the House at an early date.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The Irrigation Commission, of which Sir Colin Scott-Moncrieff is Chairman, has not yet reported; but the members have stated that "they are very sensible that the question of the extension of irrigation in India, in any large and systematic manner, cannot be treated piecemeal;" and I hold the same view. I have not received any communication from the Government of Bombay as to projects for water storage in Northern Guzerat.

Indian Currency.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether information has been obtained from India enabling him to state in round numbers how many sovereigns have been paid into the Indian Treasuries for Land Revenue, Customs, or other fiscal payments, since gold coin was made legal tender at the rate of fifteen rupees; also, for the same period, what number of sovereigns have been paid out at the same rate by the departments for the local purchases of materials, stores, salaries, interest, and other State obligations.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Since gold was made legal tender in India £25,282,000 has been received in gold by the Government of India, and £18,825,000 has been issued—viz., £7,000,000 shipped to England and £11,825,000 issued to the public. I am not able to give figures showing the nature of the several transactions in which gold has been used; but I will inquire of the Government of India whether any record has been kept from which any classification of the nature that the hon. Member desires could be prepared.

Concessions in East Africa.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will agree to give the Return respecting East Africa, &c. (Concessions), notice for which stands on today's Paper.

THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS, (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): We are expecting despatches from Africa in the course of a few days, and will then be in a better position to judge whether this Return can be granted.

The Prosecution of Mr. Whitaker Wright.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether, in view of Mr. Justice Buckley's decision to direct the Official Receiver, as liquidator of the London and Globe Finance Corporation, to institute proceedings against Mr. Whitaker Wright at the expense of the creditors on the ground that a *primâ facie* case of fraud has been shown, he will now reconsider his decision not to direct the Public Prosecutor to institute the necessary proceedings at the public expense.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): May I at the same time ask the Attorney-General whether, in view of Mr. Justice Buckley's decision, he still proposes to introduce new legislation to facilitate the prosecution of persons charged with the publication of a fraudulent balance-sheet.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): The answer to the Question of my hon. friend is in the negative. I think the control of these proceedings should remain in the hands of the Official Receiver and of the solicitors and counsel instructed by him. The Government will, of course, take all steps that will be necessary for the purpose of bringing the accused back. With regard to the question of the hon. Member for Wolverhampton, I think an amendment of the law in this matter is wanted. A Bill is being drafted, and I trust I shall be in a position at an early period to introduce it.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Home Secretary, in accordance with notice which I have given privately, why directions were not given, in accordance with practice, to the police to watch the movements of Mr. Whitaker Wright immediately after the preliminary steps had been taken for the institution of criminal proceedings against him, for the purpose of guarding against any evasion of justice on his part. Why was Mr. Whitaker Wright permitted to leave the country without any attempt by the police to obtain information as to his destination?

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: The private notice of the hon. Member I found when I came to the House just now, I do not think this is a Question which should be asked without notice. The question of the directions given in this case and the knowledge of the police in search of a fugitive are certainly not matters which can be made public in the interests of justice at the present moment. I am prepared to tell the House what I know, but I cannot prejudice the interests of justice by giving answers likely to defeat the very object we have in view. I stated last night that a warrant for the arrest of Mr. Whitaker Wright was granted at the Guildhall Police-court yesterday morning. It is now in the hands of the City Police for execution. The Metropolitan Police are co-operating with the City Police, and I have satisfied myself that all possible steps have been taken by the two forces to effect arrest. I would repeat that the Government will use every means to that end. The police inform me that Mr. Whitaker Wright has not been at his home since 21st February. The judgment of Mr. Justice Buckley was not given until 10th March, and the prosecution did not apply for a warrant till 11th March.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that, after the statement made by the Attorney General that there was no case against him, Mr. Whitaker Wright said, "I think I will go away to Egypt for a time?"

Court of Session—Edinburgh.

MR. URE (Linlithgowshire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether his attention has been directed to the fact that the present accommodation in the Court of Session is inadequate for the public requirements; and whether, seeing that plans showing the requisite additions were prepared by officials in the Board of Works Office nearly twenty years ago, the Government propose to take any immediate steps to remedy the existing deficiency of accommodation.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The question of the additions required to provide for proper accommodation in the Court of Session has been receiving the attention of the Board of Works, and I am hopeful that progress will be made in the matter at no distant date.

Death Certificates in Scotland.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the opinions expressed in regard to death certificates in the Report of the Cremation Committee recently issued, will the Secretary for Scotland consider the expediency of introducing legislation at an early date relative to death certificates in Scotland, especially having regard to the fact that the last published Returns show, that out of 6,620 deaths in the Highland Crofting Counties in one year, no less than 1,479 were uncertified.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Secretary for Scotland cannot at present undertake to introduce legislation on this subject.

High Pavement School—Nottingham.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether at the time when the Board suggested that the children in the intermediate department of the High Pavement School, Nottingham, should be sent to All Saints' National School, his attention had been called to the fact that the High Pavement School is more than a mile from All Saints' School, that the bulk of the children proposed to be transferred live on the side of the High Pavement School away from All Saints' School, that the space between the schools is open land, unoccupied and unprotected, and that, owing to the assaults that have taken place on this land, children have been forbidden to play there. And, whether, in view of the danger the children living on the far side of this unoccupied land may run in going to and from All Saints' School, he will reconsider his refusal to allow the School Board to continue, for the purposes of the intermediate school, the temporary use of the rooms which have been so used since August 1892.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): From reports in their possession the Board of Education understand that the distance between the High Pavement School and the All Saints' School is not more than half-a-mile, and they have no reason to think that the space between them, though open, is dangerous. As I said on Tuesday,* the All Saints' School was not the only school suggested, though it was especially mentioned by name, as it was known to have a large number of vacant places. The Carrington Road Board School is also only half-a-mile distant, and the Scotholme Board School is sufficiently near for the children of that school to use the laundry of the High Pavement School. There are, I believe, vacant places in both these schools. The Board of Education, as at present advised, see no reason to alter their decision with regard to the laundry and gymnasium of the High Pavement School, the use of which does not affect that school only. But they will, of course, be prepared to consider carefully any representations which may be made to them on the subject. I may point out that the date at the end of the Question should be August 1902, not August 1892.

---

* See page 266.

MR. M'KENNA: Will the hon. Gentleman further inquire as to the distance and nature of the ground between the two schools?

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Yes, but I may say I have here information which does not correspond with the description given by the hon. Member.

Charleville Licensing Case.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a licensing case against Mr. Edmond O'Flaherty at the Charleville Petty Sessions on the 2nd inst., and to the evidence and conduct of Acting Sergeant Hourihane; is he aware that the case was dismissed by the unanimous decision of the magistrates; and, in view of the terms in which this policeman alluded to certain traders of the town, will notice be taken of his conduct by the constabulary authorities. I beg further to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the attention of the constabulary authorities has been called to the conduct, on recent occasions, of Acting Sergeant Hourihane, now stationed in Charleville, County Cork; is he aware that this policeman committed an assault on Mrs. James Martell of that town in the month of February, which was duly reported to the district inspector, Royal Irish Constabulary; has his attention been directed to the statements of this constable to a respectable merchant, Mr. Biggane, on his leaving Charleville Petty Sessions Court on the 2nd inst.; and will he say what steps do the constabulary authorities intend to take in regard to this police officer.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The hon. Member has been good enough to send me a newspaper report of the proceedings in this case. Charges have been preferred against the Acting Sergeant (three of them at the suit of Mr. O'Flaherty), which will be investigated by the magistrates in Petty Sessions on Monday next. For the present, therefore, I am debarred from discussing the action of the acting sergeant.

MR. FLYNN: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire as to whether this constable assaulted Mrs. Martell?

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes; but as judicial proceedings are pending, I feel debarred from expressing any opinion on the matter.

Irish National School Teachers—Grade Regulations.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when the National Board of Education intend to place teachers in their respective grades according to the new regulations; and will each teacher be placed in the grade not lower than the class he now holds under the old rules.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that all teachers in the service prior to the 1st April, 1900, came under the new system of gradation in accordance with the terms of Rule 200 (e) and (f), and have been graded accordingly. Classification has been abolished for all future teachers, and in the case of teachers in the service prior to 1st April, 1900, there is no necessary correspondence between their former classes and their present grades.

Irish Teachers' Increments.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether trained teachers will be awarded increments in the case of schools where the general proficiency of the pupils at the annual inspection is described by the inspector as fair, but which suffer from irregular attendance.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The course adopted by the Commissioners in this respect is defined by Rule 200 (b) of the Code. Awards of good service salary will also be contingent on the actual incomes of individual teachers, the average attendance at their schools, and other considerations. Each case will be judged on its merits, subject to the general rules governing all cases.

Technical Instruction at Monivea, County Galway.

Mr. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to a resolution of the Tuam Technical Instruction Committee in December last requesting the County Galway Technical Instruction Committee to allow a sum of £10 a year for rent of a house for technical instruction at Monivea, County Galway; and whether, seeing that this sum was voted by the County Technical Instruction Committee on the 11th December, 1902, will the Department of Technical Instruction raise any objection to the County Committee paying over the sum of £10 to the local Committee.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Provision for the payment of the sum mentioned was not made in the County Technical Instruction Scheme for the year ending July next, which has been approved by the Department. There is no power, therefore, to approve of payment now, but the matter can be adjusted when the scheme for next year is under consideration.

Fishing Season in County Down.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the Upper Bann River, County Down, the fishing season closes every year by order of the Coleraine Board of Conservators on 30th September, while in the other County Down rivers the season is open till 31st October by order of the Dundalk Board of Conservators; and whether, in view of the inconvenience caused by the enforcement of the earlier date to the Upper Bann fishermen, and of the refusal of the Coleraine Board of Conservators to accede to the request of the Belfast Anglers' Association to recommend the extension of the time on the Upper Bann, he will arrange for an inquiry to be instituted locally with a view to the extension of the season, or to the transfer of the control from the Coleraine Board to the Dundalk Board.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The facts are correctly stated in the first part of the Question. With respect to the holding of a local inquiry a legal disability exists which the Bill introduced by me last year, but which failed to become law, was intended to remove. The inquiry cannot, therefore, be held until the new Department is empowered by legislation to deal with such questions.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Does the right hon. Gentleman propose to introduce the Bill?

Mr. WYNDHAM: Yes, if there is any prospect of it passing; but we already have a very heavy legislative programme.

Castletown Postmistress.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the wife of a policeman stationed in the village of Castletown, Queen's County, has been appointed postmistress there; and, in view of the inconvenience of the premises, whether he will state who recommended this postmistress, and lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the memorial from the inhabitants of Castletown and district recommending Mrs. Murphy for the appointment.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I appointed Mrs. Quinn on condition that she became tenant of suitable premises, and that her husband retired from the constabulary, as I considered her to be the candidate most suitable for the appointment. I cannot comply with the request contained in the latter part of the hon. Member's question.

Mr. DELANY: Had the husband resigned about the time of the appointment of his wife?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The post was offered to the wife on the condition that her husband did resign.

The Ex-Banbridge Postmaster.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether the official who was forced to resign the postmastership of Banbridge, County Down, has been restored to the public service; and, if so, will he state what appointment he now holds, and under what circumstances he has been reinstated.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The officer in question has been appointed Postmaster of Coupar Angus, as I considered that although he had failed in his management of the Banbridge Post Office he might safely be entrusted with the charge of a smaller office.

Mr. MACVEAGH: And this is the only Irish postmaster appointed to a Scotch office during the last ten years!

THE IRISH LAND BILL.

Mr. MALCOLM: Can the Prime Minister state when it is likely that the Irish Land Bill will be introduced?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think I have already indicated to the House that the Bill is ready, and that we are anxious to introduce it at the earliest possible moment. On the other hand, as the House knows, there are obligations thrown upon the House by the law which obliges us to get through a certain amount of important financial work before the end of the financial year. As soon as that financial work is disposed of I propose that the Irish Land Bill shall be the first business.

NEW BILLS.

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To abolish Dealers' or Grocers' Licences in Scotland," presented by Sir John Leng; supported by Mr. Crombie, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Pirie, and Mr. Hunter Craig; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 5th May, and to be printed. [Bill 95.]

COUNTY COURTS BILL.

"To extend the jurisdiction of the County Courts, and to amend the Acts relating or giving jurisdiction thereto," presented by Sir William Holland; supported by Mr. Crombie, Sir Alfred Hickman, Mr. M'Kenna, Mr. Parkes, and Mr. Schwann; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 96.]

LICENSING ACTS CONSOLIDATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To consolidate the Laws relating to Licensing in Scotland," presented by The Lord Advocate; supported by Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland and Mr. Anstruther; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 97.]

BERWICKSHIRE COUNTY TOWN BILL.

"To constitute the Town of Duns to be the Head Burgh or County Town of Berwickshire," presented by the Lord Advocate; supported by the Solicitor General for Scotland; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 98.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To make further provision for Local Government in counties of Scotland; and for other purposes," presented by Mr. Maxwell; supported by Mr. Nicol, Mr. Eugene Wason, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Hozier, and Sir Charles Renshaw; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 25th March, and to be printed. [Bill 99.]

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To provide for Superannuation Allowances to Poor Law Officers and Servants in Scotland; and for contributions towards such allowances by such officers and servants; and to make other relative provisions," presented by Mr. Maxwell; supported by Sir William Arrol, Mr. Nicol, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Cross, Colonel Denny, Mr. Ure, and Sir Charles Renshaw; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 25th March, and to be printed. [Bill 100.]

REGISTRATION OF FIRMS BILL.

"For the Registration of Firms and Persons carrying on Business under Trade Names," presented by Mr. Emmott; supported by Mr. James Heath, Sir Alfred Hickman, Sir William Holland, and Mr. Walter Palmer; to be read a second time upon Friday, 8th May, and to be printed [Bill 101.]

SUPPLY [1st ALLOTTED DAY.]

Considered in Committee:—

(In the Committee).

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the chair].

ARMY ESTIMATES 1903-4

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £9,647,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the charge for the pay, allowances and other charges of His Majesty's Army at home and abroad (exclusive of India) (General Staff, Regiments, Reserve, and Departments), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1904."

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said that so far as these debates on the Army question had proceeded the Committee would not differ from him when he said that they had been marked with great good humour and by the absence of personalities, the only exception being the debate on the preceding night, which every Member of the House would no doubt regard with regret. The Government on their part had accorded those who differed from them on this question of the Army the greatest facility for laying their case before the House and the country, and they were very sensible that the right hon. Gentlemen, the Prime Minister and the Secretary for War, had not desired on any account whatever to prevent these questions being most thoroughly and carefully discussed. He would venture to express the hope that, if the present debate should come to a conclusion that evening, the Prime Minister would afford them another day for discussing the Report Stage. He wished to emphasise the fact that they were not criticising the action of the Secretary for War; they were criticising his policy, and the right hon. Gentleman would admit that if in the recent reconstruction of the Ministry he had had the fortune, good or bad, to go to the Treasury, he would at this very moment be regarding those whose action he was no doubt, under existing circumstances, strongly disapproving, as praiseworthy, admirable, and proper Members of the Conservative Party. Had any other Minister occupied the position the right hon. Gentleman now did, and were he pursuing the same policy, he would have met with the same hostile criticism. This was a Vote for money, and it brought home with great force the increasing cost of the British Army. If the hon. Gentleman would look back only five or six years he would see that to-day we were spending upon our armaments double the sum which was then thought necessary. We had built up great fortifications; we had organised new regiments; we had purchased all manner of cannon and all means of protection, and what was the result? No one looking at the question as an impartial man could say that we felt to-day more secure than five years ago, or that we had less cause of apprehension from the other nations of the world. The hon. Baronet the Member for Glasgow told them in debate two nights ago that if it were desired to reduce the expenditure the last item to be touched should be the Army. Surely that was not a proper consideration. If any hon. Gentleman could show the same extravagance to exist in other Departments as undoubtedly existed in the Army, he was sure there would be no lack of Members in that House to draw attention to the fact. The view which had been put forward on that side of the House that those who opposed expenditure upon armaments were necessarily unpatriotic could only be compared with the opinion held on the other side of the House that all who supported the expenditure on education—whether wise or unwise, whether economical or the reverse—were what he might term obscurantists. Such questions must be dealt with on their merits, and there was no reason why those who approached the question of Army expenditure from the point of view of efficiency should be mistrusted because possibly in their hearts they nourished some love of economy. After all economy and efficiency, so far from being antagonistic, were twin sisters.

He wished to draw attention to a few facts which a careful study of the Army Estimates could not fail to bring to the attention of hon. Members who cared to spare the time. The first was the fact of the increasing cost of the Army and the diminishing return proportionately for that increasing cost. He would give a couple of instances taken at random from items of expenditure which fell within the scope of that Vote.

The Secretary of State for War talked the other day about too little being said regarding the Militia. He would take the case of the Militia now. In the year 1898–9 there were in this country 103,000 Militia, and Lord Lansdowne estimated the cost for that year at £553,000. In the present year, according to the returns presented to Parliament, it was estimated that there were 102,000 Militia, and they were to cost £903,000. It was quite fair and necessary to say that they must deduct £150,000 for what the Prime Minister had called the Great Militia Reserve—the Great Militia Reserve which every hon. Gentleman, according to his right hon. friend, had omitted to thank the Government for creating, and which was at present, of course, absolutely non-existent. But £150,000 was taken in the Votes last year for the formation of this Reserve. But, of course, because it was not in existence it was not necessary to utilise that sum. Putting aside the £150,000 for this valuable force, there remained this fact, which he invited the Committee to consider with attention: the Secretary of State for War had invested £200,000 of public money in the Militia, and as the result of this extra investment he produced 1,000 Militiamen less than he had in the days when Lord Lansdowne administered the War Department. That was one instance illustrating the point he was endeavouring to establish—the increasing cost and the diminishing return. There was another point, namely, the expenditure on the War Office General Staff. Of course, when they approached this item in the Estimates they did so with a feeling of hope, because they knew that the great scheme of decentralisation had lately been carried into effect, and that, of course, it must produce proportionate economy at Headquarters. His right hon. friend the other afternoon said—

> "Scarcely a day passes that we do not transfer work and responsibility from Headquarters to the new Army Corps staff, which are created in the country."

Let the Committee look at the first fruits of this policy of devolution and decentralisation. In 1898–9 the cost of the War Office was £245,000; in the present year it was estimated to cost £301,000. That was an increase of £28,000 on last year's Estimates, and an increase of £56,000 or 20 per cent. on the last normal year. He reminded the Committee that this was after a very liberal reduction had been made of £30,000 allowed for the extra expenses incidental to the South African campaign. Of course "the labourer is worthy of his hire," but he ventured to think that the Committee would be of opinion that an increase of 20 per cent. in the clerical staff of the War Office was a wholly inadequate reward even for the great exertions and achievements of that Department during the last few years. When he discovered in the Estimates, which he had examined carefully, this increase of £28,000, he was led at first to believe, indeed, to hope, that it was due to an increase in the Intelligence Department, but when he looked at the Army Estimates he found that the estimated cost of the Intelligence Department, after all the agitation, and in response to the demand that the brain of the Army should not be starved, was £27,428 as against £27,721 in the last year. This great and desirable economy had been effected, he observed from a close examination of the Estimates, by abolishing one lithographic draughtsman and one superintending clerk, and by substituting two ordinary military clerks.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): And also doing away with the Permit Office, which is no longer required.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he was very anxious to obtain information. Was that not allowed for in the extra expenditure due to the South African War?

LORD STANLEY: I will answer the hon. Gentleman later on.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he would await with great interest a statement showing what increases had been made in the Intelligence Department. Unless the noble Lord said that the adding of the Mobilisation Department to the Intelligence Department had caused the increase, he did not know how it could be explained. While on this branch of the subject he would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, when he alluded to district officers, he alluded to that class of officers who used to be known as A.Q.M.G., and who, under the new Army Scheme were known as D.A.A.G.B. If he was right in his inference it was a very strong order, because they had only half the duties in connection with the different districts with which they were connected. Any accretion to the Intelligence Department attributed to the position of these officers was very illusory, and it ought not to delude the House of Commons in considering this question. He had one more point illustrating his argument of the diminishing return. If the Secretary of State for War and others would refer to the Army Estimates at page 12, they would find under "Total Force" a very useful statement which could be easily understood. From that statement it was easy to make a comparison with similar items in the Estimates of 1898–9. In 1898–9 Lord Lansdowne asked the House of Commons to take upon the establishment of the Regular Army 171,000 regular soldiers, and 83,000 Army Reserve, making a total of 254,000 men. For that total force he asked Estimates of £18,000,000 approximately. In the present year my right hon. friend asked the House of Commons to take on the establishment 197,000 Regular soldiers, and 70,000 Army Reserves, making a total of 267,000 men. The right hon. Gentleman would be the last to dispute that the Army Reserve and the Regular Army were the preponderating and most important part of the Estimates. These figures showed that while he obtained an increase of 13,000 men, there was an increase of £9,500,000 of money on the Army Estimates. That was to say, for an increase of 8 per cent. in the number of men he had caused an increase in the expenditure of 35 per cent.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): What year?

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said the comparison was with the year 1898-9, which, as the right hon. Gentleman would recollect, was the last normal year before the war.

*MR. BRODRICK: I wish to explain to the Committee that when numbers are voted by the House they are included in the Estimates, but everybody knows that an addition, a very large addition, was made in the year 1898. I think the number was 17,000 men, and it was mentioned at the time that we could not expect to raise all these Regulars in the same year. The amount voted was the money necessary for the men that we expected to raise, and that was included in the Estimates.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he would endeavour to be fair, and he had no doubt that some drawback should be considered under that head. The Estimates of this year amounted to £27,500,000, and the Committee had heard of such things as Supplementary Estimates. It was quite possible that the cost of the Army this year would exceed the somewhat optimistic Estimates set forward in these Estimates. But that was not all. Let him remind the House what this £27,500,000 included and what it excluded. The £27,500,000 included the expenditure in regard to South Africa, some of which might continue—his right hon. friend would not deny that it might continue—for two or three years ahead. It excluded all reference to expenditure under the Mowatt programme—a very important item. It excluded practically the whole of the increased pay. In these Estimates there was an item of £495,000 for the increase paid, which fell due this year. There was also a windfall in respect to the deferred pay of nearly £430,000, which might fairly be written off against that. It excluded all the extra provision for barracks. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to give the Committee some idea of the extra cost they must pay with regard to barracks. Of course it would be an extension of the Military Loans Act of

1891, but it would be a great convenience to the Committee if they were able to calculate in regard to barracks the probable ultimate cost of the Army Scheme of 1901. It excluded all expenditure with regard to the new rifle, which his hon. friend the Member for Plymouth referred to the other day. That was not considerable. It consisted in the cost of cutting a number of inches off the barrel of the rifle—a somewhat doubtful advantage some experts considered. It excluded certain artillery expenditure which was likely to become an important item in future. They had been told that the Volunteers had been entirely re-armed with modern guns. Forty-four batteries of Volunteer artillery had been partially re-armed, and eighty-one batteries remained armed entirely with obsolete weapons, and he said that they ought to be given modern weapons or disbanded.

There were other items which would make themselves felt more and more in the future. The Reserve was to be brought up to 140,000. The Committee could calculate what that would cost at £9 per man. The Yeomanry, at present strength, numbered 22,000; they were to be increased to 29,000, and, if possible, to 45,000; that meant an additional £20 per man, but it was a much more desirable increase than under the head of skeleton and immature recruits. There was to be an increase of the Militia from 100,000 to 150,000 at about £16 per man.

*MR. BRODRICK said that the Militia was not increased from 100,000 to 150,000. The proposal was that on mobilisation the Militia should be raised to 150,000 by the addition of the Reserve.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: Then the increase was on the Militia Reserve, which would cost £6 per man. He was anxious to bring home to the Committee and the country what the ultimate cost of this Army Scheme would be, to which they were committing themselves by associating themselves with this policy. They had had lately a promise of economy in the future, when the Reserve was filled up, which, he thought, was very encouraging, but of which they would never have heard but for the desirable or undesirable signs of revolt which had made themselves felt below the Gangway. How did the Committee imagine the Reserve was to be filled up? The Line battalions were to be kept in a state of efficiency. They were inefficient *cadres* at 750 but efficient at 800! There was very little margin there. But the whole strength of the case, as presented by the right hon. Gentleman and the Prime Minister, was that this was the irreducible minimum of men necessary for the defence of the Empire. Let them not delude themselves in this matter. The Reserve was only a shadow of the men with the Colours. The proportion of the men with the Colours was the proportion of the men who would be in the Reserve. The moment the men with the Colours were reduced in order to effect the promised economy, the Reserve which was being piled up would begin to be reduced. It would be doing what the right hon. Gentleman the previous night accused the Liberal Government of doing—living on accumulated stores.

*MR. BRODRICK said they could not tell exactly the strength to which the Reserve would grow, because they did not know how many men would join for three years service with the Colours and nine in the Reserve, or for four years with the Colours and eight in the Reserve. Every man who joined for three years' service with the Colours would strengthen the Reserve. If there was a reduction of strength with the Colours, as hinted at the other day, the reduction of the Reserve would, of course, be of some magnitude.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said that the process of the reduction of the Reserve might be slow, but it must come. Another point was, what was the quality of the new Reserve as compared with the old? Three years was not a very long time in which to train a soldier, and in a few years after passing into the Reserve he would lose much of his acquired habits of discipline and training. He would point out that this Reserve would be on the same level as the conscripts in France and Germany, with this difference, that whereas the conscripts were taken from the whole of the population, including a considerable proportion drawn from the superior classes, unfortunately our Regular soldiers were drawn from the poorest and least favourably circumstanced of all His Majesty's subjects. He would ask the Committee to look back on the inconsistent and contradictory proposals which had characterised the military policy of the Government for two or three years past.

The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War came down to the House and proposed the system of five years with the Colours and seven in the Reserve; he would have nothing to say to the three and nine years' system. Last year he adopted the latter system. Then, three years ago, the right hon. Gentleman was convinced that no increase of pay which the House of Commons was likely to grant would result in any very satisfactory increase in the number of recruits for the Army; but last year his right hon. friend, in a most eloquent and convincing speech, insisted that an increase of pay would be of great advantage to the recruiting for the Army. Last autumn a Bill was passed, one part of which proposed to create an Auxiliary force out of the men who had served with the Colours, and another part proposed to create a Reserve from men who had served in the Yeomanry. It might be quite right to strengthen the Auxiliary forces at the expense of the Regular Army; and it might also be perfectly right to strengthen the Regular Army at the expense of the Auxiliary forces—he did not think so—but they should have the two systems at one and the same time. They were told by the most distinguished military advisers, on the authority of the right hon. Gentleman, that every single man asked for was required—that that was the irreducible minimum, but it might be worth while to consider whether, besides being necessary, it was also possible.

That brought him to the question of recruiting for the Army, for which the country was paying so much. What kind of an Army was it going to be? The right hon. Gentleman set great store on the Report of the Inspector-General for Recruiting, which was his main staff in all these debates. In that Report it was stated that in the present year 50,753 recruits had been netted, as against 47,039 in the preceding year. That was the greatest number of recruits netted in one year under the short service system. Now, 50,000 recruits was the minimum number with which the right hon. Gentleman could manage his scheme, which only left a margin of 750. If the recruiting did not come up to the right hon. Gentleman's estimates, hopes, and beliefs, then his scheme, however necessary or desirable, was going to fail, and he would have to come down to the House of Commons to make fresh proposals. And if it was going to fail, all this unnecessary increased expenditure should not be gone into. The right hon. Gentleman had got to prove to the Committee that the increased pay asked for would increase the number of recruits and improve their quality. Increased pay operated in two ways. It operated immediately when the people of the country read these debates and read the advertisements of the recruiting agencies. There was another circumstance from which the right hon Gentleman might get some advantage in the course of two or three years, and that was when it was known that the soldier had more money in his pocket than before, and that the Army was a better place to live in. But these influences had not had time to work. It was the immediate influence which they had to deal with. What was the result of the increase of pay? In paragraph 55 of the Report of the Inspector-General of Recruiting it was stated that "recruiting was unsatisfactory for nine months." That was for six months after the right hon. Gentleman made his statement as to increase of pay. But during the last three months of the year, the Report went on to say, "there was a vast improvement." The increase of pay and the increase of recruiting did not synchronise. Increase of recruiting was due to the pressure of want, the approach of winter, and the reservists who had come home from South Africa having been thrown on the labour market. Everybody was trying to give these reservists every advantage in the way of employment, and consequently the avenues to the employment of young men were blocked. The latter had therefore found their way into the Army. It was no exaggeration to say that last year was an exceptional one for recruiting According to his hon. friend's contention the increase of pay would not stimulate recruiting.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham) said he merely stated that the prospect of increased pay was not sufficient to attract recruits. They wanted the actual pay.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said that that was entirely his point, which was that there was an accretion of men, not in consequence of the increased pay, but because of the pressure of want and winter. He admitted that the right hon. Gentleman had got his recruits; but let the Committee look at the altered condition under which he had got them. In 1901 34,000 recruits enlisted for seven years with the Colours. In 1902 only 9,000 enlisted for seven years. In 1901 8,000 recruits enlisted for three years, and in 1902 38,000 enlisted. That was an exact transposition of the men who enlisted for seven years and for three years. That, of course, was contemplated by the right hon. Gentleman, and was part of his scheme. But let the Committee observe what it meant. In order to compare the recruiting volumes which had been secured during the years 1901 and 1902, he had made a calculation multiplying the number of men who joined by the period for which they enlisted each year. He multiplied one set of men by three years and another set of men by seven years, and the result was that in such a phenomenal and exceptional year of recruiting as 1902 was, they only obtained 208,000 years of service, as against 290,000 years of service in 1901, or a difference of 80,000 years of service. Of course, the right hon. Gentleman expected to be able to induce the men who had enlisted to extend their service. That was a vital question which they had to consider with reference to the sums they were asked to sanction. What would be the alternative before a recruit when he was asked to extend his service. On the one hand, he saw the prospect of going into the Reserve for nine years, during which period he would get 3d. per day for doing nothing, a great advantage in the labour market. On the other hand, he would get 6d. a day extra if he stayed in the Army and went to India. That was a proposition which a young man would think it worth his time to consider very carefully. He would, however, have to decide at the very period when discipline had become a burden, and had not yet become a habit. Many of his friends were returning to civil life; he himself, perhaps, wanted to marry, and was looking forward to life in an English manufacturing town with 3d. a day on which he could count. He would have to decide when to remain in the regiment would involve a change of scene and association, and of everything that would make it desirable for a man to remain in the Army. Would the right hon. Gentleman get a sufficient number of re-engagements to make up the deficiency of 80,000 years of service. The figures up to the present were not very encouraging; only 13 per cent. had re-engaged, and he understood that the right hon. Gentleman required 50 per cent. If the right hon. Gentleman failed to make up the deficiency, he would be forced to increase the £27,500,000 sterling, of which he had spoken, by a very large additional bounty to induce the men to make it worth their while to extend their service.

There was another point that he wished to submit to the Committee. Short service in the Army, however excellent, affected the Militia. The more the conditions of the Army approximated to the conditions of the Militia, the more recruits would be taken from the Militia for the Army. That was borne out by the figures, which showed that the number of men who joined the Regular Army from the Militia had increased. The right hon. Gentleman, he believed, was less prejudiced against recruits joining the Regular Army through the Militia than recruits joining the Regular Army direct, because, under certain circumstances, it did not impair the appearance of the recruiting returns, as such men, although there was no desire to falsify the returns, must necessarily be counted twice over. If the quantity of the recruits was doubtful, he would ask the Committee to examine, for a moment, their quality. The right hon. Gentleman stated that only 16·2 per cent. of "specials" had been enlisted, as against 33 per cent. in 1898, and 34 per cent. in 1899. That was one of the figures which, more than anything else, influenced the House during the debate on the Address; and since the debate it appeared that no more "specials" were to be enlisted. They were absolutely abolished, ruled out of existence by a stroke of the pen; there were no more "specials" in England; they belonged to the dark ages. That was very encouraging. But what was the cause of the abolition of "specials?" The Inspector-General of Recruiting was evidently a man of great ability, with a certain pleasing ingenuousness of character which made itself felt between the lines of his Report. He stated—

> "Owing to the introduction of the new system of medical examination, the number of men specially enlisted has considerably decreased."

Nothing could be plainer. They were not in a position to judge the medical test. He believed the new test was a very elastic one; it meant the inflation of the recruit's chest, and the difference in measurement when his lungs were full of air and when they were not. No doubt that was a very up-to-date and a very suitable test. There was only one point in connection with it that was vital. Was the new test as severe as the old test? If it was not, then, of course, all comparison, all statistics, all the rosy accounts in the Report were absolutely valueless. Was it likely that the test was more severe, or even as severe, as it was before?

He would ask the Committee to consider one or two things in this connection. First of all, supposing the test was not so severe. His hon. friend made a very excellent speech yesterday, but he regretted that he did not carry it to its logical conclusion in the Division Lobby. His hon. friend told the Committee that 106 "specials" out of 180 men were enlisted in one depôt, although they were not specified as "specials" in their attestation papers. That would show that the new test was not as severe as the old test. Let the Committee remember the position in which the right hon. Gentleman was. No one was more concerned in the supply of recruits than the right hon. Gentleman was. The whole of the scheme which he had put forward with so much courage and enthusiasm depended on the supply of recruits. He had an urgent need for men, and was making a larger demand on the same class of the population. They were informed by the Inspector-General of Recruiting that an unpleasant feature of his Report was the gradual deterioration among the working classes, particularly in the towns. That was the class on which the right hon. Gentleman was making a larger demand; yet the percentage of rejections in that class, which was deteriorating, was less than in the previous year. The percentage was 32·22 as against 35. The Inspector-General added that well-educated recruits showed a marked falling off. It was perfectly evident that one of two things must have happened. Either by a stroke of the pen, or by some marvellous feat of legerdemain, the physique of the nation had been universally improved; or, on the other hand, the test by which the nation was being judged at the recruiting offices was easier. He would leave hon. Gentlemen to form their own opinion. He was not in the least convinced by the returns which had been presented, either that the number of men would be attained, or that their quality would be maintained. Nothing in the facts or figures proved that; and unless the right hon. Gentleman was able to prove it, he had better make up his mind, while there was yet time, to reconsider his Army policy *de novo*, and rely, as he believed he could rely, on the generosity of the House of Commons, in retracing his steps. If he would abandon the policy to which he was committed, he would encounter no further opposition, but only silent support, even in the very quarters where he must, otherwise, expect the most relentless, uncompromising opposition and criticism.

They had advanced a long way in the consideration of the question, during the debates they had had on the subject. He would like to refresh the minds of hon. Gentlemen as to the various positions which had been successively abandoned. He would not refer to the minor positions. First of all, there was the question of a great Regular Army for home defence. They did not hear much about that now. Then there was the historic phrase which the right hon. Gentleman used at the Colonial Conference against "pitting" the British Army against European troops. "Pitting" was a curious word; and he looked it up, and found that it meant to pit one against the other, as cocks were matched. The idea of "pitting" a small British Army against European troops had now apparently been abandoned. The right hon. Gentleman was so pleased with it, that he used that particular phrase no less than four times in eleven lines. Then they were told of commitments in three continents, two of which had now been disposed of, because after the visit of the Colonial Secretary to South Africa and his effort at conciliation, it would be disrespectful to suggest we should ever again need three Army Corps for South Africa. There remained, therefore, but the Indian continent, but during the course of the debate on the previous night the Prime Minister had considerably whittled down the facts that 120,000 men were needed for the defence of India. Some, no doubt, would be sent to India, and others would be sent to skirmish in other places not specifically defined.

He had noticed lately that whenever a division took place on this Army question it was always in its result hailed with loud Ministerial cheers; but they did not rely on mere numbers, they relied on arguments. It was unfortunately one of the conditions of debate that the divisions were taken by a large number of hon. Gentlemen who had not listened to the debate but, who came in at the last moment and who very often, if the Army policy was ten times as costly and ten times as foolish as the present, would vote for it with equal equanimity, and would most mistakenly encourage the Government to get deeper into the mire. He believed in the arguments used both in the House and through the country, which would build up an enlightened public opinion on the question of Imperial defence, and he believed most of all in the force of circumstances which would make themselves known to the right hon. Gentleman through the agency of the recruiting officers; circumstances which in the course of a year or two would make the British public regard this scheme with the greatest distrust and disfavour, and place the Government in a position from which they would not be able to extricate themselves without a considerable loss of credit.

*COLONEL WELBY (Taunton) said the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had dealt with the financial and economical conditions of the Army Corps. That was a matter in which he did not now propose to follow, but as he might have to go into technical questions he hoped he would not weary the House. He had entered his reduction on the Notice Paper at this particular time, because it was the first place in the Army Estimates in which the words Army Corps were mentioned. It was not to be found anywhere in the previous Vote, nor in the index, and only once in the body of this Vote, all other references being in the appendices. He urged upon the House that if these Army Corps were really to be genuine Army Corps, all the Estimates relating to numbers, pay, trains, and services should be reframed, and the amounts divided up among the different Army Corps, so that hon. Members might be able to know what the expenditure of these Army Corps really was, and judge for themselves. In the Vote under discussion there was a vote for general staffs, but those staffs were not split up into the divisions in which they were to be placed in the Army Corps; they were all lumped together in such a way as to make it impossible to separate the items. After a very careful consideration of this system, extending over two years, he believed, from a military point of view, it was unworkable, and utterly unsuited to the needs of this country, and, from a Parliamentary point of view, it was a scheme possibly fraught with grave danger to the Constitution. These were no doubt strong opinions to put forward at this time, and hon. Members might well ask why they were not put forward two years ago, when this scheme was introduced, but it would be remembered that on that occasion the Resolution was, after considerable discussion.

closured, and the main question put; had it only been closured far enough to admit of Amendments he would have moved to change these six Army Corps into three or four military commands, and have taken the sense of the House upon it. The history of this scheme showed that it was the child of panic, and when the returns and the *Army List* were examined it would be found that these Army Corps were nothing more nor less than the grouping together of district commands. As a matter of fact, the right hon. Gentleman had commenced his Army reform from the top instead of the bottom: he had started at the roof instead of the foundations. What he ought to have done was to group the units together in brigades, and to have grouped the brigades in divisions, and in this way have arrived at divisions properly organised, and that having been done, it probably would have been found advisable not to proceed further with the scheme of organisation. He did not deny that with careful organisation it would be possible to have real Army Corps in these districts, but it would be a task of extraordinary difficulty, rendered greater by the re-organisation having begun at the top instead of the bottom. But suppose these Army Corps had been successfully organised; upon that subject he would like to ask two questions. Assuming the Army Corps to be organised, were the district commands to remain much the same as the old district commands, or were they to be thoroughly re-organised both as to area and as to the troops, so as to form true divisions of an Army Corps system? Then, according to the White Paper, there were a certain number of battalions belonging to the Army Corps still abroad. Suppose one of these battalions returned home, and with ten or twelve years to serve in the United Kingdom before going abroad again, would that battalion spend the whole of that period in the particular Army Corps command in which it was located on its return, or would it be shifted, according to the requirements of the home Army, from one command to another? If the latter, it would be totally destructive of any reality in the Army Corps system. That this matter had possibly not been thought out was shown by the Return of the Army Corps, in which the units were scattered about, some belonging to one command being stationed in another, many units not yet returned, and there being absolutely no mention whatever of trains, services, or any of the accessories which made up the reality and mobility of an Army Corps. If the Secretary of State had really understood what an Army Corps was, he could not possibly have furnished such a Return to Parliament. The House of Commons ought to insist, in future, whenever there was a Return of an Army Corps command, that it should be a real, and not merely a paper Return. If a board of directors advertised a universal railway in the United Kingdom, and it was then found that they had scattered groups of rolling stock dotted about the kingdom, but no locomotives or permanent way, would it not be thought that those directors were absolutely ignorant of the duties they had to perform? These Army Corps were very much in that position. The units were dotted about the country in groups, but there was no permanent way—which, in the case of an Army Corps, was the trains and services—or locomotives, there being no commissariat in the Return, and an Army, as all knew, marched on its stomach. What did the right hon. Gentleman look forward to in case of war when these Army Corps had been mobilised and sent away? The problem was much simpler in Germany. There no man was called up for military service until he was twenty years of age. He then served three years with the Colours and four years with the Reserve, followed by thirteen years in the *landwehr*, from which he was drafted into the *landsturm*. Hence in peace time there were men of three different years with the Colours, so that on mobilisation two-thirds were available for war, and only one-third had to be replaced. In the Reserve there were soldiers of four different years, or one-third more than the peace establishment with the Colours, so that the Reserve filled up the fighting units to overflowing. Behind that was the *landwehr*, which was more than double the fighting force of the field army. The German system was built on that one foundation. Every man went through the same drill, and therefore took his place with the fighting unit with the same experience behind him. How could that system be compared with our mixed system of Regulars, Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers. It was absolutely impossible for it to be so adapted as in any way to approach the perfection of the German system. When the three Army Corps of Regulars, filled up with Reservists, were mobilised, the men would be taken from the parts most exposed to invasion, and the Committee ought to know how they were to be replaced. Supposing the Army Corps had been in existence, in what way should we have been more ready for the wars of the past? How should we have been in a better position on the outbreak of the South African War? The ranks could only be filled up by mobilisation, for under this scheme he did not see how there was to be an efficient fighting force which could be instantly sent abroad. An Army Corps was a complete little army in itself, and to have mobilised one when affairs were so strained in the Transvaal would have been tantamount to a declaration of war. The only force of any use would have been some brigades, which could have been quietly shifted into the garrisons on the frontier without attracting more than ordinary attention. Before the Committee permanently undertook this great responsibility, the practical advantage that was to accrue ought to be proved. It was assumed that the number of the auxiliary Army Corps would remain at three. If there was to be a real and complete organisation of our Auxiliary forces, there would have to be, not three, but twelve or thirteen Army Corps, for a mixed system, composed partly of Army Corps, could not be efficient. Such an organisation, he believed, would be a dangerous military machine in this country. It was sometimes said that those who opposed the scheme were disappointed military critics, or men with fads of their own, but he ventured to say that they had behind them a constantly growing body of public opinion, founded not upon professional criticism, but upon a distrust of a standing Army and militarism. The people of the country, looking forward to the time when there would be these highly-organised military units, saw in them a possible danger to their constitutional liberties. Let one too powerful subject arise, and he might use this great organisation to seize supreme power. Two years ago the House adopted the Army Corps system without understanding it, but it was not yet too late to turn back. The House was a strong one; strong men acknowledged their errors; only the weak and effeminate were afraid to do so. Before it was too late, and before they burdened the nation with this ever-increasing expenditure, he earnestly urged upon the Committee to turn back now, and declare that instead of having these Army Corps they would have an extension of the old constitutional system. In Ireland there was a Commander-in-Chief responsible for the troops there; let this be extended to the United Kingdom and two other such military commands created, and let there be within them Brigades and Divisions organised as highly as possible, but have nothing greater than a Division, and in such a system he was sure they would find constitutional safety, and an organisation which would be best fitted for the needs of the whole Army.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER, (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said he wished to move a reduction upon this item. There was an enormous increase in the expenditure under this new system, and it would go on year after year, because as these Army Corps developed the efficiency of the Army would have to be developed as well, and consequently the whole of the expenses would increase. The Reserves would increase, and so would the staffs and stores which would be necessary to make up these real Army Corps. The reaction against this expenditure had already begun, and if the Government went on increasing their expenditure, in spite of the feeling in the country, there was not the slightest doubt that the day would come when this reaction would be so strong that not only would these large items for Army Corps be put down, but the expenses of the Army would be largely reduced to a dangerous extent, and possibly the same thing would apply to the Navy. He was sure that all who had the welfare of the Empire at heart would like to avoid such a result. The hon. Member for Oldham had pointed out a good many things that were not included in the Estimates, and he wished to point out that the ranges had not been provided for. If they continued increasing this expenditure reaction was sure to come, unless they could show that they were making economies in other directions. A reduction could be made on the staff as it existed, but instead of this they were proceeding to greatly increase the staff.

He noticed on page 7 of the Estimates a permanent increase of £5,000 a year. But what ought to have been done in this case was to decrease the expenditure by at least four times that amount. It might be said that all these large staffs were not required except for the purpose of giving instruction to the men. A man did not get instruction in commanding troops, and he did not learn the art of war by being the general in command at Gibraltar or Malta. Therefore, these were not the men they wanted to teach the work of generals. They wanted to teach the young men these duties, and not the young men who had earned their laurels. The men of the future were those they wanted to teach. One of the great advantages put forward for this new system of having an extra staff for this division was that the men should get accustomed to the officers in command. He thought the men would see very little of the general in charge of their Army Corps, but the people they wanted to get accustomed to were the brigadiers. Under this new system, however, they could never make a brigadier a permanent brigadier, for they would be continually changed. If they had all the brigadiers appointed to the different brigades they would not get the men permanently accustomed to them.

The really important point which ought to have been observed in the formation of these Army Corps was to form permanent brigades of troops, and send out the drafts in brigades instead of battalions. Then they could train their brigadiers and men regularly together. The new system of Army Corps had also another defect. Under the old system they had before them a much better scheme, because this country had very often to send from one to six battalions abroad at once. An Army Corps would not help them to do this. Under the old system at Aldershot the regiments were ready to go to India, and they always had a certain number of troops up to war strength. Under this new Army Corps system the Regulars would be distributed in the various Army Corps, and they would not be under the same brigadiers as would be sent abroad. The men would be selected from the different commands and they would not be together as under the old system at Aldershot. He believed this item was the one upon which a reduction could most easily be carried out in the least time, and with the least injury to the Army. By this reduction they would not take away one efficient man. With regard to the officers and the staff he thought it had been shown in South Africa that the men who had had the most training had continually failed, and the men who had had little training had been successful over and over again. If it had been shown that this new scheme would improve the staff and teach them the actual art of war, he thought there would have been a great claim for not reducing this Vote. He thought a reduction was absolutely necessary, and he begged leave to move the Motion standing in his name.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A, Pay, etc., of General Staff, be reduced by £60,000." — (*Mr. Courtenay Warner.*)

*COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince) said that in his opinion it was unfortunate that the words "Army Corps" had been used in connection with the scheme instead of the word "Commands." He thought it would have been better to have included in the Divisions, Cavalry Brigades, Artillery and Engineer commands all troops, whether Regular, Militia, or Volunteers, and to merely indicate those of the Army Corps associated with the command by an asterisk or in some other way. He had no doubt, however, that the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman would come all right. He only hoped that the staff would be cut down to whatever was necessary for the duties they had to perform.

*SIR A. HAYTER (Walsall) thought those who were opposed to the system of Army Corps ought to support the Amendment for the reduction of this Vote. He wished to call attention to three increases which were of the same character, and amounting in all to about £20,000. It was essential that the Committee should be aware how the increase in the expenditure arose, because, as the hon. Member for Oldham had pointed out, by the adoption of the Army Corps system they were not at the end, but the beginning, of a very large expense. There were now four more major-generals, the number being increased from twenty-eight to thirty-two, the increase on the Estimates being £4,470; there were thirteen additional colonels on the staff—forty-nine against thirty-six—increasing the Estimates by nearly £10,000; and there were thirteen additional deputy assistant quarter-master generals — forty-one against twenty-four — increasing the Estimates by £6,658. These additions to the charge for "Pay, etc., of General Staff" were consequent upon the additional officers required under the Army Corps system. Of course, having adopted the Army Corps system, they must look to the fact that a great many more general officers would be employed.

One of the reasons why the Secretary of State for War asked Parliament to adopt the system was that it would mean a policy of decentralisation. He was the last person to object to any policy of decentralisation which could possibly be carried out. The right hon. Gentleman referred yesterday to the larger powers which had been given to commanding officers, but such powers, he thought, might have been conferred on the Generals formerly commanding Districts. What was the difficulty in entrusting Generals of Districts with powers to enter into contracts for forage, for repairs, for transport, or matters of that kind? If such powers had been conferred on them it would not have been necessary to have this enormous increase in the pay of the General Staff. There was one point on which he desired an answer with respect to the financial department, and that was whether any arrangement had been made whereby the innumerable returns sent to the War Office to be audited would be dispensed with in future. He understood that it was intended to submit pay lists to a financial officer in the district, who would be able to give them a final audit. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to tell the Committee that the audit in the division would be the final audit.

On the general question of the Army Corps system, he agreed with those who thought it was not suited for this country. One of the great objects which the right hon. Gentleman had in view, namely, that the men should become accustomed to their commanders, could not be carried out under a system in which they brought out the regiments only by employing Reserve men. Of the wars in which this country engaged, 99 out of 100 were wars in which only a small force was employed. If they sent a brigade to Ashanti, or a division to South Africa, that was as much as they could possibly want. But to do so, is to break up the Army Corps system. Was the Army Corps system suited to times of peace? In times of peace they had to send out continual drafts of troops to the colonies, and for that reason the integral units could not be kept up at all. Again, as to the Militia and Volunteers. Up to the present time our system for the Auxiliary forces had been a county system, and he was very doubtful, indeed, whether the new system of Army Corps was suited to the wants of the Militia Volunteers. He believed it would be a dangerous and expensive one, and he was very glad that the hon. Member for Lichfield had taken this opportunity of pointing out that there would be a very great increase for the cost of the staff, and for the building of barracks.

MR. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.) said he desired at once to disclaim any right to address the Committee on the Army Estimates from the expert point of view. He did not pretend or claim to have behind him any of those authorities to which the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War had referred. He did wish, however, to ask his right hon. friend a very plain and simple question, and one on which he hoped he would be able to give an equally plain answer. When the hon. Member for Whitby moved an Amendment to the Address, condemning the whole Army system, he voted against him, because, according to immemorial practice, an Amendment to the Address was regarded as involving a question of confidence in the Government. He had no desire to replace the Secretary of State for War and the Financial Secretary to the War Office by any of the Gentlemen on the Front Bench opposite. Though he disagreed with some of the suggestions that had been made by the Secretary of State for War, he was quite certain that he had done the work in a much more complete and efficient manner than the hon. Gentleman sitting on the Front Bench opposite would have done. As to the whole question of the Army Corps system, whether it was to be continued in the future or not, and whether the cost of the system was to be reduced or not, the First Lord of the Treasury pointed out that it would be folly to reduce the numbers of the Army at a time when our Reserves were very low.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that the hon. Member must confine his remarks to Vote A.

MR. GALLOWAY said he was sorry he had transgressed the ruling of the Deputy-Chairman, but he had understood that he could discuss the whole question of the Army Corps system on this Vote. He would reserve his remarks to another occasion.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District) said that there was a great deal of information, more than had yet been given, which should be supplied to the Committee to enable hon. Members to form a correct judgment on the question before them. For instance, he entirely failed to see the effect on the new Army Corps of our financial system. For instance, on page 125, the details of the general staff for home service were given :—"Commanding Army Corps, six generals." Three of them, the generals commanding the First, Second, and Third Army Corps were full generals, and the other three were lieutenant-generals. The pay of the first three generals was £2,928 each per annum, with, he presumed, house accommodation and allowances, and that of the three lieutenant-generals was £2,013 per annum. He wanted to know if that pay included all the money these generals received from the country ?

*MR. BRODRICK said that the generals of the first three Army Corps would be paid as generals, with certain allowances as well. The officers who might be appointed to command the other three Army Corps would be paid as lieutenant-generals. In point of fact these were not all new appointments.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said that his next question was a practical one. When he looked at the *Army List* he found that the staff of the Army Corps at Aldershot had been fully constituted. General French was the Commanding Officer, with twenty-one officers on his staff, and two additional officers detached from the War Office. Now that was a much larger staff than existed at Aldershot under the previous system. Was it intended that, under the new system, there should be this large permanent staff at Aldershot? It looked to him as if they were going to have as large a staff at Aldershot as if the Army Corps there were going on a war expedition on the morrow. Was it absolutely necessary that such a large staff should be maintained in time of peace? He was not for a single moment suggesting that the salaries of the generals were excessive.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said that the discussions on the Estimates were mainly useful, not for the purpose of turning out the Government, but of obtaining information from them, and for that purpose he had risen. This Vote for the pay of the General Staff included the Vote for the pay of the Inspector-General of Remounts. Major General Truman, he believed, was that officer's name. Now, that general and his conduct had been very considerably canvassed in this House some time last year; and a strong disposition had been manifested on the part of the House to hold that general responsible for the tremendous mistakes he had made in the conduct of the Remount Department. As a consequence of these remarks in this House, the Commander-in-Chief sent for the Inspector-General of Remounts and told him, as was known officially, that he was an incompetent officer, and dismissed him. After that, General Truman was granted a court of inquiry. As to what that court of inquiry had done, or the conclusion it arrived at, the Committee had no information whatever. He believed he was right in saying that the Inspector-General of Remounts who figured in this Vote was General, or a sort of General, Truman, and he wished the Secretary of State for War to tell the Committee, if he could, under what circumstances General Truman was dismissed by the Commander-in-Chief, and had been allowed to remain in this employment, and whether it was proposed to maintain him in this employment?

Then he wanted to ask a question in regard to the Military Attachés. There were ten of them, at £800 a year each. Could the right hon. Gentleman tell the Committee where each of these Military Attachés was now placed, and specially, he would like to know whether the Military Attaché at Vienna was the same as was at that post for the last year or two; because he was the man who had suffered a stigma at the hands of General Truman when he offered to advise him in regard to Austrian and Hungarian horses, and whom General Truman refused to consult? Then there were six aides-de-camp to the King, at 10s. 6d. a day each. On what grounds were these aides-de-camp selected? Of course, if they were His Majesty's selection, he had nothing to say; but if not, on what sort of principle were they selected—on the ground of merit, or what other ground?

LORD STANLEY said it was inconvenient to have to answer questions on one portion of a statement, which had been made so absolutely bound up with the whole general question of the Army, and therefore the Committee would excuse him if he were short in dealing with particular questions of detail. The question of the staff of the Army had been one of those most prominently brought forward, not only at the beginning, but throughout the whole of the South African War. There was a feeling that it was not only a staff ready to go abroad that was necessary, but that we had not left behind a staff which would be able to organise the further troops required to be sent abroad. Surely their object ought to be to lay themselves out to improve the system. Under the Vote granted the previous day, they were allowed to consider that they had three Army Corps which they might send abroad, and surely they should take in the Estimates a Vote for a further staff, when the head staffs of the three Army Corps went abroad, which they would be able to call into existence and use and amplify for any future emergency that might arise! That was the object for which this money had been taken in the Estimates. The only real criticism that had been made was as to whether this staff should be allocated in such divisions as was most likely to control efficiency, and incidentally to effect such economies as they looked and hoped for from the distribution of the various commands. The right hon. Member for Walsall asked why decentralisation only applied to the commanders of Army Corps—why not to commanders of divisions or brigades?

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER said the words he used were "District Commanders." What he had in his mind was the generals in command at Aldershot and York under the old system.

LORD STANLEY said he thought he was right when he said the right hon. Gentleman referred to generals of Division. He was against decentralising to generals of Division. He was certain that the more they decentralised from the War Office the better would it be; but the fewer hands that decentralisation was in, the better would be the result. To decentralise to the six generals in command of the six Army Corps would, to his mind, result in efficiency. It would not be cheaper, perhaps, than the present system, but it would put into the hands of commanders of Districts the power of making contracts, of buying forage, and in regard to buildings—which latter would result, he was certain, in an expenditure largely in excess of that which now existed. With regard to decentralisation, the best example he could possibly give was that of Salisbury Plain. He did not think that anyone who had not seen the work done by Sir Evelyn Wood could realise the enormous advantages, not only of the decentralisation which had been given to him in the way of money and other matters, but also the benefit they had derived by the suggestions he had made. That showed them most clearly how very much further they might proceed, by degrees, with decentralisation.

At the present moment, naturally, the staffs were large, both at the War Office and at the various Army Corps centres; but he had not the slightest doubt that, as the machine began to work easier — and it was working easier every day—and when the arrears of the war had been cleared off, there would be a substantial reduction, not in the expenses of the Army Corps districts, but in the staffs of the War Office, from which they proposed, as far as possible, to decentralise all matters of finance. The whole argument of his hon. and gallant friend was that it was not necessary to have this General Staff. When he thought of what his hon. and gallant friend had said, he could hardly see how his hon. and gallant friend could make his arguments square with his speech on the 13th of March, 1900. His hon. and gallant friend then said that in all questions connected with making this large force efficient, the necessity for combining all the smaller units by means of constant inspection throughout the country should be borne in mind; and that if that could not be done by the Headquarters Staff it should be done by the commander of the District. At the present time, he continued, the General Staff was divided into the number of different Districts; that was an old-fashioned arrangement; and if the Government wanted to make the Army really efficient, they should go to the very root of the matter and look into the reorganisation of the General Staff.

Colonel WELBY said his argument was that they should abolish the Army Corps, but keep the Divisions. He thought a Division was entirely compatible with what the noble Lord had just read.

Lord Stanley.

Lord STANLEY said that surely when his hon. and gallant friend talked of combining the smaller units, he meant combining regiment with regiment, and brigade with brigade, that they should have a staff prepared to deal with the whole of the force they might have to send abroad, and that they should not have a staff made up, so to speak, piecemeal when the time came; that they should not have a staff for 10,000 men, another for 10,000 men, and a third for 10,000 men, so that when it was necessary to send 30,000 men abroad there would be a mixed-up staff which would be called a general staff.

Colonel WELBY said he thought the noble Lord had entirely misunderstood his argument. The noble Lord must be well aware that a Division consisted of brigades and regiments. The only difference was that in an Army Corps they grouped, two or three, or four Divisions. It was the Army Corps organisation he wanted to get rid of, not the Divisions. The noble Lord did not appear to know the difference between a Division and a District.

Lord STANLEY said his contention was that they wanted to have an Army Corps ready as a unit to send abroad, and that when it was sent abroad they should not have what the right hon. Baronet called in 1900 a scratch staff drawn from all parts of the Kingdom, with the result, as the right hon. Baronet said, that when a number of individuals were suddenly thrown together there was certain to be friction on all hands. That was the very thing they were trying to avoid. They were endeavouring to get a staff which would be able to work, in time of war as well as in time of peace, without the inevitable friction of which the right hon. Baronet spoke. The whole secret of Army organisation was that they should have a force which could be increased in time of war by the Reserves. But there was one thing they could not have too large, and that was the staff, on whose organisation the whole success of an expedition would depend. The hon. Gentleman the Member for the Lichfield Division said they could not send away a trained staff because they had not got one. That was perfectly true; and it was precisely because they had not got a trained staff that they were asking for that Vote, not one penny of which he felt sure would be wasted, either in time of peace by the officers being instructed in staff duties, or in time of war by the extra effiicieney that would be given to any force that would be sent abroad.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said the noble Lord had not answered one of his Questions.

*Mr. BRODRICK said he would be glad to answer his hon. friend. His hon. friend asked a Question with regard to General Truman. The account which his hon. friend gave of the proceedings when General Truman was attacked in that House was not quite accurate. What happened was that Lord Roberts impressed on General Truman the necessity for him to clear himself of the errors committed, and gave him an opportunity of having his action considered by a Court of Inquiry. His hon. friend was quite in error in saying that the House knew nothing about the Report of that Court of Inquiry, because it was laid before Parliament and excited considerable comment.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said that what he stated, and he believed he was right, was that there was a Court of Inquiry on which a debate took place in this House, and on the morrow of that debate Lord Roberts sent for General Truman, informed him he was an incompetent officer, and dismissed him. Subsequently General Truman claimed a Court of Inquiry. That Court of Inquiry was held, but they had heard nothing of it.

*Mr. BRODRICK said his hon. friend was in error. Lord Roberts unquestionably sent for General Truman, and informed him that he had either to meet the allegations against him, or that it would be impossible for him to continue to hold his office. General Truman elected to face a Court of Inquiry, and a court was accordingly appointed. The mistake into which his hon. friend had fallen was that he thought the Report of that court had never been laid before Parliament, but it had. With regard to military attachés, there were permanent military attachés in Paris, Berlin, Vienna, St. Petersburgh, Constantinople, Rome, and Pekin; and temporary military attachés in Tokio, Brussels, and Washington. His hon. friend asked a Question with regard to A.D.C's., but as those appointments were made by His Majesty he did not propose to offer any remarks with regard to them. With regard to the question of the staff, he would undertake to say that nobody in the past had done as much as he had, to cut down unnecessary appointments. When he first went to the War Office, sixteen or seventeen years ago, there were on the staffs of general officers a number of officers for whom proper employment could not be found. There was nothing more difficult in his experience—and he believed it was the experience of every Department—than to cut down existing appointments. He remembered the first year he was at the War Office they cut down £20,000 worth of unnecessary appointments, such as a general officer having two military secretaries, who could not possibly find work. What they had now done was totally different. As he explained two years ago, and he did not think there was a dissentient voice regarding it then, they had taken £60,000 for a staff; but it was a staff for the organisation of the Army whether at home or ready to take the field. The sum for the staff for the organisation of the Army at home and abroad included a number of services as to which there had been no question before. He quite understood that hon. Members who voted last night to cut down 27,000 men might well say the staff must be cut down to the equivalent of the number of men who were cut down; but he was sure that hon. Members would not say that, having added 54,000 Regular troops to the Army and 11,000 colonials, they would refuse a staff to keep these men efficient.

He was quite sure that they would admit that so long as a certain force was maintained a proper staff must be maintained. He would take one case in particular. Nobody had proposed to cut down the sixty-six batteries of artillery which had been added to the Army, and if they had sixty-six extra batteries of artillery they must have a colonel who had a certain command of artillery, and could manœuvre these batteries in sufficient bodies, and the staff of the artillery must be considerable. He urged hon. Members also to consider the question of the better organisation of the Auxiliary forces. Up to a few years ago there was no general officer who was charged in any way with the surveillance of the organisation of the Auxiliary forces; it was a thing of quite modern growth. He would take the case of the Second Army Corps. While, on the one hand, Sir Evelyn Wood had made more savings in the course of one year than would pay for the whole of his salary and that of several of his staff officers in that district, on the other hand his staff officers were dealing during the whole of last drill season with 30,000 or 40,000 men, chiefly Volunteers and Militia, brought temporarily on to the Plain for training. The staff of the Second Army Corps would be cheap if it was only devoted to training that large number of Auxiliary forces who had now a definite place in the Army scheme, and who, it was said on all sides, should be used to the utmost for home defence.

With regard to the actual commanders of Army Corps, he thought they figured in the Estimates for £12,000 a year. No one should run away with the false impression that that was all in addition to the ordinary expenditure. The general officer commanding in Ireland had actually the same pay as he received before. The general officer commanding at Aldershot had an addition to his pay, because nobody at Aldershot was able to make both ends meet. The general officer commanding in Scotland had for a long period been paid as a lieutenant-general, and received the same pay now. The general officer commanding at York had always been paid as a major-general, and when the appointment was made —it was not made yet—he would be paid as a lieutenant-general. Therefore, out of the six appointments in regard to which this £12,000 a year on the Estimates was objected to, four were appointments already existing. The two new appointments were Salisbury Plain, which he hoped, quite apart from the Army Corps scheme, he might claim to be necessary for the largely increased training of the Auxiliary forces which took place there every year, and the London command just about to be formed, which he justified above everything on the same ground, because there were sixty-five battalions of Auxiliary forces which would come under Lord Grenfell. Without such an officer it was absolutely impossible for the War Office to receive reports and to obtain the organisation of the immense number of Auxiliary units that were comprised in that command. These sixty-five battalions, reaching about 50,000 men, was work enough for one man alone. For that reason he hoped, if a division was pressed on this question of the staff, it would be understood that it was by no means a development simply for these Army Corps; it was for services which, whether there were Army Corps or not, would have to be carried out; it was to enable them to provide, as they had provided, each of the districts with mobilisation officers who were engaged on work which had not hitherto been performed, but which Lord Roberts found effective in the field in the late war. That was his case, and he hoped hon. Members who desired the efficiency of the Army would consider these points before recording their votes.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.) said he only wanted to ask one question. Upon the introduction of his scheme in 1901, the right hon. Gentleman had laid it down as a principle upon which the whole scheme rested, that the officers to whom command of the Army Corps were given should be the officers to command them in time of war. The First Army Corps was commanded by General Sir John French, who would no doubt command it in time of war, but the Second Army Corps was commanded by an officer of whom the British nation was proud, and who had made Aldershot the seat of military instruction, but who had reached rather an advanced age. Would that officer, and the lately appointed general officer for the Fourth Army Corps, in case of an outbreak of hostilities, proceed abroad in command of their respective Army Corps? He also wished to know whether General Truman was still serving at the War Office.

*MR. BRODRICK said, after the report of the Committee of Inquiry to Lord Roberts, Lord Roberts decided that the Report distinctly exonerated General Truman from any neglect in the discharge of his duties. The Committee made some criticisms on the way in which those duties were discharged, but spoke highly of the manner in which General Truman had met the call made upon him, and they more especially pointed out that he was in no way connected with a large proportion of the questions of remounts on which very serious difficulties had occurred. General Truman returned to his work, which he had only given up temporarily during illness, and his five year appointment would expire, he thought, in January next. Until that time he would hold the appointment of Inspector-General of Remounts. The hon. Member asked him whether he had kept his pledge with regard to the appointment of Army Corps commanders. Sir Evelyn Wood was now at the age of sixty-five, and his period of command at Salisbury Plain would continue until, he thought, 1st October of next year. Before he appointed Sir Evelyn Wood to that command, on the recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief, he obtained from the Commander-in-Chief a distinct assurance that, in case of war, he considered Sir Evelyn Wood not only competent, but the most competent man to command that Army Corps in the field. What he said in regard to Sir Evelyn Wood he would say in regard to Lord Grenfell. The reason why neither of them was employed in the South African war was, of course, in the first instance, that Sir Redvers Buller was appointed Commander-in-Chief. Both Sir Redvers Buller and Sir Evelyn Wood could not be appointed, and as Sir Evelyn Wood was senior to Sir Redvers Buller, it would not have been usual for him to go out under Sir Redvers Buller. Later in the war few opportunities occurred of detached commands. Sir Evelyn Wood wished to serve in South Africa. We communicated with Lord Kitchener, who had served under Sir Evelyn Wood in Egypt, and he at once said he was prepared to serve under Sir Evelyn Wood, but could not consent to have so distinguished a soldier serving under him. Lord Kitchener's position was such that it would certainly have seemed like a withdrawal of confidence if he had been in any way superseded. The same argument applies to Lord Grenfell. He also had commanded the Egyptian Army with Lord Kitchener under him. Lord Grenfell at the time was holding the very important appointment he is about to vacate, and it would have been extremely difficult to withdraw him. I can truly say that both these officers were considered admirably fitted to serve in South Africa, and both of them would most unquestionably command their Army Corps in the field, or, if the House refused to continue the title of "Army Corps," and they could only command Districts, they would undoubtedly be put in command in case of emergency.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL GEORGE KEMP (Lancashire, Heywood), who said he quite understood the advantage of the Army Corps system so far as decentralisation was concerned, asked whether, at the present time, the officers in command of Army Corps were receiving any training other than that they had before the introduction of the system in 1901, and whether at Aldershot they had opportunities of acquiring that special knowledge of the handling of troops that they would require in time of war by the Army Corps being used as Army Corps.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.) contended that as the Amendment to reduce the number of men had been defeated it would be absurd to reduce the General Staff. A little knowledge was a dangerous thing, and he protested against the endeavour of "budding Wellingtons" and "sucking Napoleons," after three months' service in South Africa, to rule the War Office. The General commanding the Second Army Corps was the best possible man for the post, and if any reduction were carried by which his position would be affected, a gross injustice would be inflicted on the Army and on the country at large. The amount asked for was not a farthing too much. How could the generals be expected to incur the great expenditure involved by their position without adequate pay? He hoped the military Members of the House would rally as one man in support of proper provision being made for the General Staff of the Army.

*MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight) said that so far as this Amendment was intended to reduce the expenditure on that part of the General Staff necessitated by the Army Corps system, those Members who were challenging the military policy of the Government felt bound to support it. They differed from the Government on certain fundamental principles, and, although they might be altogether wrong, they had arrived at their conclusions after long and careful consideration. These conclusions had been forced on many of them in the field of war, and were sincerely held. One was in regard to the relative expenditure of the Army and Navy. And so far as the Army Corps system involved increased expenditure they felt bound to oppose it. Another ground of objection was that there were only a certain number of recruits available, and a greater number could be obtained only by reducing the standard of physique and morale. A further contention was that greater reliance should be placed on the Volunteer force of the country. No one suggested that complete reliance should be placed on that force without giving them time to be so organised and improved as to be able to take up the burden.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN reminded the hon. Member that a reduction had been moved on a particular item, and that until that reduction had been disposed of the general question could not be discussed.

*MAJOR SEELY said that on these general grounds they felt bound to oppose the extra expenditure on the Army Corps staff, but so far as the scheme tended towards decentralisation and the bringing in of Auxiliary forces they were simply friendly critics of the Government. As the question of individual commanders had been raised, he might say that in his judgment there was no one more fit to command the second Army Corps than Sir Evelyn Wood. But that raised the question of whether the War Office could hope to carry out the principle that the men who commanded the Army Corps in time of peace should also command them in time of war. That proposition sounded very well, but it could not really be sustained in practice. In order to get officers to serve in the Army they must be given a career, possibly a long and distinguished career, and, with few exceptions, and one very brilliant exception, officers over a certain age were unable to stand the hardships of modern war. If that were so, and they laid down the principle that only those officers should command these great home districts in time of peace who would command them in time of war, the War Office would eliminate from their service the very men of experience and ability whose services they would wish to retain.

The position with regard to the actual Army Corps was this. As to the First Army Corps, they might say that was reasonable and should stand. In the case of the Second Army Corps, which extended from Milford Haven to Dover, it was contended that they could not expect any man, even with the wonderful energy of the present Commander, to supervise so widely an extended district. That was a very real difficulty which he suggested might be altered and remedied by a different allocation of the Army Corps. But there also remained another difficulty. The Army Corps to which he alluded was composed entirely of Regular troops destined to go abroad at once if required. In the district from Milford Haven to Dover there was a large number of Auxiliaries, and they would have to conduct the correspondence through the Army Corps. It was plain that in the event of war the whole of the Regular troops, or what had been called the stiffening of this Army Corps, would disappear and the whole of the General Staff would also join. Consequently in such a case the Army Corps in the South of England would not only be deprived of that organisation which they had been told was so essential to efficiency, but it would also be deprived of that stiffening on which the new system so much relied. It could not be denied that that was really the case. Those difficulties might be avoided by another method of distribution. The Army Corps in Scotland and York could retain their organisation, but surely it was not seriously proposed that in the event of war the Auxiliary troops from the North of England and Scotland would come down to take the place of the troops in the South of England? If not, what became of the principle upon which these new Army Corps were founded? He thought he had shown that in the case of the Second Army Corps there was this great drawback. In the case of the Third Army Corps, with certain modifications, that might be allowed to stand. With regard to the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Army Corps they were not to be sent abroad.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member is now talking upon the General Vote, and he must confine his remarks to Item A for the general staff.

*MAJOR SEELY said this was a definite Motion to reduce the expenses of the General Staff, and he was endeavouring to show that the increased money asked for would not give that amount of increased efficiency to induce the Committee to sanction it. If they were to engage in war, they might be put to very hard straits. According to the new scheme, Sir Archibald Hunter and his Highlanders would be retained in this country to organise the Auxiliary troops in Scotland. He could not imagine that gallant soldier sitting on the top of Edinburgh Castle, watching the enemy's Fleet approaching these shores.

*MR. BRODRICK: It is perfectly evident that my hon. friend has not mastered even the rudiments of this scheme. When the three Army Corps go abroad the other three will take their place at home, and if there is an invasion, they will not be placed upon the top of Edinburgh Castle, but will take the place of the troops which have been sent away,

*MAJOR SEELY asked if he was to understand that Sir Archibald Hunter would go down to the South of England with his Auxiliary troops in order to take the place of those who had gone abroad?

*MR. BRODRICK: He would not take their place, because their place is in the various defensive positions and the garrisons they have to occupy. There are most important duties which must be performed by the troops of those garrisons.

*MAJOR SEELY said they must take the world as they found it. In point of fact they could not afford to retain such regiments as the Highlanders and such commanders as Sir Archibald Hunter for so unlikely an event as the defence of these Islands from invasion. These highly specialised men and officers must be sent abroad in the event of a war.

*MR. BRODRICK pointed out that the troops in excess of the three Army Corps would remain in England, and be under the command of the same commanders as before.

*MAJOR SEELY said that from the nature of things, when their three Army Corps had gone they would be bound to fall back upon these specialised men at home. Therefore, upon general principles, they felt bound to differ in regard to the Army Corps Scheme because they felt that they were fundamentally opposed to those principles, although they realised they were principles which had been carried on for many years. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War had merely been continuing those principles, and in doing so had not only done this to the best of his ability, but also with the greatest ability.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL hoped he might be permitted in two or three minutes to put some reasons before the Committee why hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House would fail in their duty if they did not support the Amendment the hon. Member had moved. These Army Corps, it had been stated, were formed for foreign expeditions and home defence. He contended that in foreign expeditions it was never likely, under any circumstances, that an entire modern Army Corps would be employed in a foreign country, and on the face of it it was absurd, because such an Army Corps could not be transported to its proper place in ships, and could not be embarked from any of their ports.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member must not go into such questions. This is only a debate on the General Staff, and I think the hon. Member appears to misunderstand what is the question before the Committee.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said they objected to the General Staff because they did not think the Army Corps suggested were fit for foreign expeditions in the first place. In the second place they objected because, in regard to home defence, the Army Corps would not provide for the organisation of the Auxiliary forces, and it was absurd, on the face of it, to have a plan to move three Army Corps all the way down from Scotland to take the place of troops in the South of England. He opposed this scheme because the Army Corps system was the corner-stone of the military proposals of the right hon. Gentleman, which they believed involved a financial outlay which this country could not properly afford. [Cries of "Divide, divide!"]

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said he rose to ask a question of great importance concerning the whole of these Estimates. They had been drawn up in a new and a very confusing manner. On page 7 hon. Members would see under Item A.

"Pay, etc., of General staff.

Decrease - - -	£348,370.
Normal Increase - -	5,530.

Then they were told by way of explanation that this was—

"Due to provision being made for Temporary Staff for Manœuvres and for the pay of additional officers for the Remount Department."

That was not a decrease but an increase. Then they gave a number of columns of what the War Office chose to call special expenditure, connected with South Africa, China, and Somaliland expeditions, and they made an estimate of what they called a sum due to these wars. That was not the way to draw up Estimates, but they should take the actual sum last year and this year. If there were any differences not stated they should be given to the Committee. With regard to the normal increase of £5,530, which was set out on page 7 of the Estimates, he could not find that sum in any part of the Estimates. Could the noble Lord, or his right hon. friend, refer him to any page in the Estimates where he could find that total, or could he give any explanation of how it arose?

*MR. BRODRICK replied that there appeared in the Estimates items which did not occur this year. Although the decrease was practically £348,000 in this case there a normal increase of £5,500. What the House wanted to know was not the difference between war and peace Estimates, but the difference between the amount last year and this year, and that was the sum he had stated.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said the normal increase was not in any single case shown, nor on what principle it was arrived at.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 94; Noes, 226. (Division List No. 24.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)
Allen, Chas. P. (*Glos., Stroud*)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbt. Hy.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (*Derbyshire*)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter (*Lanark*)
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (*Carmarthen*)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (*Cardign*
Douglas, Charles M. (*Lanark*)
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Saml. T. (*Glamorgan*)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (*Leith*
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm.

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt Hon Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David B. (*Swansea*)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Labouchere, Henry
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (*Accrington*)
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (*Cornwall*)
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (*Carmarthen*)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir C. M. (*Durham*)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R. T. (*Dumfries*)
Robertson, Edmund (*Dundee*)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbt. L. (*Cleveland*)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles E. (*Stafford*)
Shaw, Thomas (*Hawick, B.*)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (*Forfarshire*)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, RtHn C.R. (*Northants*
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, J. A. (*Glam., Gower*)
Thomson, F. W. (*York, W. R.*)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (*Barnsley*)
Wason, J. Cathcart (*Orkney*)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (*Norfolk*)
Whiteley G. (*York, W. R.*)
Whitley, J. H. (*Halifax*)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, H. J. (*York, W. R.*)
Wilson, John (*Durham, Mid*)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (*Hud'sf'ld*)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Courtenay Warner and
Mr. Charles Hobhouse.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (*Walworth*)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (*Man'r*
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (*Hornsey*
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (*Leeds*
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Fras. T. (*Windsor*)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benj.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. G. (*Lynn Regis*)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alx. H. (*Shropsh.*)
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn J A (*Glasg.*)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (*N. Lancs.*)
Cavendish, V C W (*Derbysh.*)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J A (*Worc*
Chamberlayne, T. (*Southmptn*
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Right Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Cox, Irwin Edwd. Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (*Antrim S.*
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, H. Shepherd (*Bolton*)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Jos. C.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Ed.
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (*Man'r*
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H (*City of Lond*
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (*Linc*
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld. G. (*Midx*
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heath, Arthur H. (*Hanley*)
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Jno (*Kent, Faver hm*
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (*Denbigh*
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (*Salop*
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (*Glasgow*
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (*Monm'th*)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, A. H. (*Hants, Fareham*)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (*Evesham*
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (*Bristol, S.*
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (*Lowestoft*
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Killop, Jas. (*Stirlingshire*)
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (*Wigt'n*
Maxwell, W J H (*Dumfriesshire*)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William
Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
More, Robt. Jasper (*Shropshire*
Morgan, D. J. (*Walthamstow*)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robt. Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (*Bute*
Myers, William Henry

Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (*Salisbury*)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James *reenock*)
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon M. W. (*Stalybridge*
Ridley, S. Forde (*Bethnal Green*
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (*Sheffield*)
Robertson, H. (*Hackney*)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, *verpool*)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Saml. Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.
Scott, Sir S. (*Marylebone, W.*)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (*Renfrew*)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (*Romford*)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, H. C. (*North'mb, Tynside*
Smith, Jas. Parker (*Lanarks.*)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (*W. Bromwich*)
Stanley, Hon. A. (*Ormskirk*)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (*Somerset*)
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir Jn. M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hn. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (*Chichester*)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (*Oxf'd Uni*
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (*Sheffield*
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (*Notts*)
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (*Birm*
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. S. (*York, E. R.*)
Wilson, John (*Falkirk*)
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (*Yorks.*)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (*Bath*
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said he was rejoiced at the change of the temperament of the House compared with what he had observed in the last two or three years. A very little time ago any Gentleman who proposed to increase the expenditure on the Army would have been applauded as patriotic, not only by hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, but by some on his own side; and had anyone ventured to criticise such a proposal, and to say that the money was not needed, he would have been told that he was a traitor to his country. It was the irony of fate to find that hon. Gentlemen who formerly took that line were now as eager for economy in Army matters as he was himself. Yesterday they had voted on the Amendment moved to reduce the Army by 27,000 men. That Amendment was not carried, but it was very evident to those who were in the House, and to the country outside, that, if the really true opinion of the House had been consulted the Amendment would have been carried by a very large majority. In considering what should have been done under these circumstances, it was necessary to look into that Vote. The majority was ninety-one, but twenty-five Unionists voted in the minority, and there were also a considerable number of abstainers. The Unionists who voted in the minority were the intellectual cream of the other side of the House. Their Irish friends abstained from voting, but it was known that they were opposed to all increases in the Army. They had made some sort of arrangement with His Majesty's Government. He was not blaming them for that, but there was a time when hon. Gentlemen on the Government side of the House blamed the Liberal Party for being traitors in making an arrangement with the Irish Party. Somehow, therefore, the Irish Party did not vote. If he were an Irish Member he should look after the interests of Ireland, and in all probability do precisely the same as they had done. There was another point, that the voting on the Amendment took place under the threat on the part of the Government that if it were carried against them they would resign. It was perfectly well known that a large number of men on the other side preferred their Party to their country, and thought it would be a terrible loss to the world in general if the Government were defeated and resigned.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that the hon. Gentleman must confine himself to the Vote on the Paper.

MR. LABOUCHERE said he was explaining that the Vote had been granted for the men, and that under some circumstances that might have been the opinion of the House; but his argument was that that was not the real opinion of the House. He thought it had been made pretty clear that the House and the country were thoroughly against this addition of 27,000 men, and therefore he would not pursue the subject. This was hardly a moment to waste several millions in getting these 27,000 men. They were voting this year £3,000,000 extra for the Navy. Owing to the militarism and the military expenditure of the country, trade was stagnant, Consols were on the down grade, wages were going down, and taxes were going up. Therefore, they should be most careful not to incur any expenditure which was not absolutely necessary, for they had to fall back on the Income-Tax which pressed on the middle classes, and on taxes on the necessaries of life which were much felt by the lower classes. For years past he had protested against increased expenditure on armaments, but he had been as a man preaching in the wilderness, and the expenditure had gone up to over £80,000,000. He had been called a Little Englander, but the fact was, he was, and had always been, a consistent follower of that eminent Conservative statesman, Sir Robert Peel. In the days of Peel, when demands were made for increased military expenditure, that statesman replied that: "We must incur certain risks; that we could not, without crippling the country, over-tax the people by a war expenditure in time of peace; that it was foolish to look round and see whether there could be any imaginable combination which would be serious or dangerous to the country. The insurance against that would be too high, and a bad, unbusiness-like proceeding." With these dicta of Sir Robert Peel, he had squared his action in denouncing and voting against every increase of expenditure. They had voted the 27,000 men but where did the control of the House of Commons over the Executive come in? By the power of the purse. It was by that power of the purse that they got, to a certain extent, their own way. He had previously moved the reduction of the pay after the men had been voted, and the reply of the Government to that was: "What? You have voted the men; would you refuse to vote their pay?" That was Parliamentary nonsense. They would not get the men if they did not vote the pay. Consequently, he maintained that it was their business to act in this matter according to Constitutional usage, and to refuse to vote the money which led to useless and needless expenditure. This Vote for the pay was £8,149,600. That was for 210,000 men, which came out at £36 odd for each. He would, however, deal generously with the Government, and put it down at £30 per man, £30 multiplied by 27.000 came to £710,000. His Amendment therefore was to reduce the Vote by the sum of £710,000.

He was a great advocate for voting in this House. They heard a great deal of talk and noble professions about economy in this House. He was no believer in Parliamentary eloquence; what the constituencies wanted to know was how their representatives voted. If they were practical men it was really time for them to step in and put an end to this wild and reckless expenditure. They had a very able member of the Government who was at the present moment on his travels. That able Gentleman was recently in the island of Teneriffe, and made a speech in which he said he hoped so to expand and enlarge the British Empire that it would reach the skies, and that he would be satisfied if he could only credit himself with having added one brick to the Empire. That one brick was £80,000,000 per annum at the present moment, and if it was to be only the first brick of our Empire reaching to the skies, Heaven alone knew what would happen. He did not think they would ever reach Heaven, or at any rate they would attain the bathos of bankruptcy before reaching the goal. It was said that the colonies were strongly in favour of our spending our money on military affairs. He did not know whether that was the case or not, but most people were strongly in favour of other people spending other people's money. He understood that the colonies had refused to have anything to do with what Sir Wilfred Laurier had called our vortex of

Imperialism. The whole of this vast expenditure for building an Empire to the skies—he did not know what that meant, although it might be the latest exposition of Birmingham Imperialism—had to come out of the pockets of British tax-payers. If hon. Gentlemen honestly believed in the Vote which they gave yesterday, that these 27,000 men were unnecessary, they should pursue the Constitutional course of voting against the money. And he would really urge those Gentlemen who voted with the Government, not on the merits of the question, but because they were Party men, to reconsider their position. He was not a strategist. An hon. Gentleman talked about "budding Napoleons" and "baby Wellingtons," but he did not know anything about that. He looked at the matter, however, from an economical point of view, and he was satisfied that they could not go on spending on the Army and Navy without soon finding out that they had touched bottom.

The hon. Gentleman opposite said that Louis XIV. said that victory would remain with the man who had the last sovereign. France, he should then imagine, was the richest country in the world; but victory did not remain with Louis XIV. He found that foreign countries united against him, and any country that went on with the foolish game of "Beggar-my-neighbour" would find that it would be beaten in the long run. He was not opposed to the honour and glory of the Empire being maintained, but he did not believe that this expenditure, coupled with the policy on which it was based, was one that was really for the honour and glory of this country. It would spell ruin in the end, and would crush the commerce of the country. He wanted the money spent for the benefit of the people of England themselves by removing the burdens that had been placed on trade. That was the proper course to pursue, and they ought to make a beginning at once. The Government themselves admitted there was a very strong feeling, which was not confined to this side of the House, against this expenditure, and he had no doubt that if the question were left to the House to be decided on its merits there would be a large majority against it, as he believed there was a large majority in the country against such wild and lavish expenditure. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £8,937,000, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

MR. GALLOWAY said that during the debate on the reduction moved by the hon. Member for the Lichfield Division, he put a question to his noble friend, and he now desired to explain that he did it, not from any hostile motive towards the Government, as he voted for the Government in the division which was taken on the Motion. He would not vote for the reduction which had been moved by the hon. Member who had just spoken. In the first place, he did not in any degree share his views; and in the second place, he believed that the hon. Member's rough and ready calculation as to the amount of money required to pay 27,000 men would, if carried out, have the effect of reducing the Army by a far greater number of men. He did not hold the same views of patriotism as were held by the hon. Member, and he did not wish to be associated with the hon. Member's views, or the means he had taken to support this country in its time of trouble. He had, however, one thing in common with the hon. Member, and that was the desire that this enormous expenditure on the Army should not be increased in the future. The First Lord of the Treasury pointed out that the time to reduce the Army was not when the Reserves were low, or when the Army was depleted in consequence of a great war. That argument entirely convinced him, and, although he was opposed to any further increase in expenditure on the Army he had voted with the Government in order to maintain the Army which the Government thought was necessary for the defence of the country. The question he wished to ask his noble friend was: Would the Government pledge themselves not to increase the normal expenditure of the Army over and above £27,500,000? He of course excluded any exceptional circumstances that might arise. He understood, for instance, that the War Office were about to provide a new rifle; and that, of course, would be abnormal expenditure. He did not wish to bind his noble friend down to any particular sum of money in the matter, but he wished to know whether the Government were determined that the expenditure which they now asked, and which they were thoroughly justified in asking, was to be the limit of expenditure on the Army. He believed that if they did not make some limit to expenditure, they would inevitably go on until they brought financial ruin on the country.

The Committee should remember that, in deciding the amount of money to be spent on the Army, there were other items which would have to be met, such as expenditure on the Navy, and the land question in Ireland. He believed that it was all-important that they should have a statement from the Government on the matter. The Leader of the House taunted certain of his hon. friends with having shouted for Imperialism, and now objecting to pay for it. He was as anxious as any one to pay what was necessary for the honour and glory of the Empire, but he was also anxious that they should have, not an expensive Army, but an efficient Army, and that the money should be expended in the best possible way. He was anxious that the administration of the War Office should be an efficient administration, which he thought it was not at present; though in saying that he did not mean anything personal to his noble friend. He urged on his noble friend the necessity of arriving at a limit of expenditure; and if the Government did that, they would have nothing to fear when they asked the Committee to vote money they believed to be necessary for the maintenance of the Army.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said there were certain items on the Estimates which might be withdrawn without any loss of efficiency; and he would ask the noble Lord whether he could hold out any hope that men who were ineffective should be removed from the *Army List*. He referred to two sets of men; men who were employed in garrison regiments, and Native and Chinese regiments who were in charge of coaling stations in the East. Those garrison regiments were raised in a time of great panic, when troops were required at any cost, and they were hustled out to the Mediterranean and other places to take the place of troops who were required for active service. They were quite inefficient in the field; and, therefore, did not fulfil the *dictum* of the Secretary of State that the Army, though small, should be efficient. They were a great deal more costly than ordinary troops, as, besides their pay, there was the item of the deferred pensions by which, when a man reached the age of sixty-two, he drew 1s. 6d. per day. That sum had never been brought into the calculations of the Secretary of State. Then there was the great question of providing barracks for the wives and families of these reservists, which had entailed a further Vote for the barracks at Gibraltar, Malta, Halifax and elsewhere. These troops were of no use outside the limits of the garrison at which they were stationed, because they could not be moved. He thought forts defended by second rate troops were a delusion and a snare. The right hon. Gentleman, very much against his will no doubt, had entrusted the defence of our coaling stations to troops which were not of the best because they were past their prime. But whatever might be said of the troops garrisoning the Mediterranean stations, that argument ould not be used with regard to the Indian regiments at Hong Kong and the Straits Settlements. Ten thousand native troops held the only two coaling stations we had in the Eastern seas. To a certain extent, on those stations the whole safety of the China Squadron depended, and yet the right hon Gentleman had depleted those garrisons of white men in order to put Native regiments, whose loyalty he feared would not hold out against the blandishments of a foreign Power, in their places.

Lord STANLEY said he could not help thinking that the debate to-day was more or less an echo of the question which had been decided on the previous day. The hon. Member who had just sat down had spoken with some contempt of the garrison regiments, but the hon. Member would not find many of the military authorities who had to deal with these regiments agree with him. These regiments were composed of men who, in other walks of life, would be called actually in their prime. They were not put into such a position that they might become a mobile force, but in a position most suited to them, with the result that in Gibraltar and Malta our garrisons were composed of the best men who had passed through the ranks of the Army. The housing question was admittedly a difficult one, but in this respect he did not think the difficulty ought to force the country in any way into reducing the number of troops who were, in his opinion, of the greatest possible advantage to the Crown. With regard to the coaling stations in the East, those were stations where the garrisons must vary from time to time. The Committee of Colonial Defence sat continuously to deal with these matters, and any recommendations which that Committee made would at once be taken into serious consideration by his right hon. friend the Secretary of State.

With reference to the question of the hon. Member for Manchester, hon. Members knew that there must be increases in Army Votes for pay which would not come into effect until next year. Of course, every year there were different sums to be paid on the loans, the money of which had been used in the building of barracks, but against that would be set the fact that what was commonly know as the Mowat System had completed the Reserve stores, and the reduction on that side would be put against the increase on the other. The hon. Member for Oldham had stated that the Vote showed no increase for the Intelligence Department, but that was not in reality the case. The hon. Member had also spoken of the irreducible minimum of the Reserve, but with regard to that, the hon. Member could not have followed the right hon. Gentleman in his explanation, of yesterday, of how, when the Reserve got to 100,000, he might be able to economise by reducing the number of men. The hon. Member for Oldham stated that if the number to go in were limited, naturally that would limit the number going out. That was pretty obvious, but if that were done, and the same number sent into the Reserve as that which came out of the Army, the country would, in fact, have a Reserve of 150,000 or 160,000, which was too large, and so therefore if they limited the number going into the Reserve, they would limit the Reserve. In regard to increased pay, he had argued against increased pay except with the long service, whereas this was increased pay with short service.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham) asked whether it was a fact that the pay was increased only for the long service.

LORD STANLEY said that that was the case. It was true, as the hon. Member for Whitby had said, that they were to a certain extent gambling on a sixpence. Time alone would show whether the extra sixpence would get the number of men they required for the Indian drafts. Those most competent to judge thought it would secure the required number, but he would prefer to wait and see what the result was. The hon. Member had spoken of the small margin in the number of recruits. It had to be remembered, however, that the effect of the increase of pay had not been felt. Everybody who knew the private soldier knew that until he got the money in his pocket he would not believe in its existence; therefore although they had several things in their favour, such as bad trade and low wages, they had not in their favour what he believed would be an important factor, viz., that in two years' time they would have men actually in receipt of the extra pay. The hon. Member had made another deduction as erroneous as some of the others. He had taken the number of men joining for three years, and by an elaborate calculation proved that the War Office were losing something like 80,000 years of service. But before the introduction of the new system they took all men, whether they liked it or not, for the long period of eight years; now they took them for the short period, and did not ask on joining whether they intended to extend their service. The only way in which a comparison could be made was to wait until after the first year of the new system, and then compare the number of men extending their time for the long service plus those who in the first instance joined for the whole service.

As to the increased pay not having increased the number of recruits, the House should remember that for a large part of the year the War Office were taking on a great number of men at high rates of pay for special services in South Africa, and although they could not expect to get the whole of those men into the force every year, they might at all events hope that a certain percentage of them would be encouraged by their Army life and the additional attractions that were held out to enter the service. It was also said that the medical tests were less. The Inspector-General of Recruiting had told him that his intention had been and was, to try to reduce the number of men avowedly unfit for the Army, before they reached the medical officer, by previous inspection, and by showing the recruiting officer that it would not be to their advantage but to their disadvantage to continue to send up such men. That was the principal reason for the decrease in the percentage. He had endeavoured to deal with all the points that had been raised, and he hoped the Committee would now allow them to get the Vote.

*LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE KEMP said he still felt a certain amount of apprehension that the right hon. Gentleman would not get the number of recruits he required in the future, because the surplus hitherto had been in the most popular branches of the service, viz., the cavalry and the artillery, while in the infantry the difficulty had been experienced. Recruiting for the cavalry and artillery having been stopped, what probability was there that the required number of recruits without any specials would be forthcoming in the future? On this matter he desired to make a personal explanation. It appeared that a letter he had written to *The Times* had given rise to the impression that he imputed bad faith to the Secretary of State. He absolutely repudiated the idea; nothing was farther from his intention. He had simply desired to point out that the decision of the right hon. Gentleman had been come to only a short time before the Address, whereas, from the statement, it might be supposed that it had been in force for some time. As to the increase in the Vote for the Intelligence Department, he strongly felt that it was not at all in accordance with the requirements of the country. The total amount spent on the Indian Intelligence, the Naval Intelligence, and the Military Intelligence, was a small sum in comparison with the amount spent by the Germans on their Army alone—about £250,000. The country ought to be satisfied that if they were ever engaged in war again they would get the requisite information to prevent a recurrence of the South African disasters. No imputation had been cast on Sir John Ardagh and the other Intelligence officers, at any rate, in the House——

*MR. BRODRICK: Oh yes.

*LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE KEMP said that personally he had always contended that the Intelligence officers did their work very well, but that we did not have enough information. In opposing the Army scheme generally he, at any rate, had a clean sheet, because since its introduction in 1901 until this session, he had been out of the country. He felt very strongly against the scheme on the ground of expense, because it might be said that the requirements of the Navy had been starved in consequence of the amount spent on the Army. They knew perfectly well that with the best intentions in the world and with perfect sincerity, the right hon. Gentleman who spoke for the Admiralty had stated that the Army Corps Scheme had not affected their demand for men and ships; but statements of this kind were relative and not absolute. The present Secretary of State for India had said in 1888 that the state of the Navy was satisfactory, and then he came down, three or four months after that statement, and asked for £20,000,000. That showed that the statements made as to the actual state of the Navy could not be regarded as absolute. During the last two months they had seen two battleships of the most approved type sold to another Power. Supposing the Estimates of the Army had been £10,000,000 less, did they suppose that this would have occurred? They should remember that two battleships at that time would count four on a Division. As the House yesterday decided to vote these men, notwithstanding all the arguments that were brought against them, he felt that he could not give a vote now to reduce their pay. As the men had been voted, they could not break faith with them, for they were in duty bound to vote the money for their pay. He thought all those who had criticised the Government policy would feel that the pay should be voted.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said the argument of the hon. Member who had just sat down was most illogical. This was the only opportunity they would have for giving a straight vote for economy. A suggestion was made that the number of men should be reduced, and now the hon. Member said he would not vote for a reduction of the money, although he opposed the vote for the men. Having stated that a smaller number of men was necessary, when it came to the test of finding the money hon. Members ought to be consistent and express the same views in the Lobby. If hon. Members opposite were convinced that too much money was being asked for by the Government, then they ought to take every opportunity of reducing the amount. At the earliest stage of this debate he took objection to the position the Secretary of State for War took up in describing these Estimates as almost normal. He had compared the Estimates of 1890 with the Vote asked for this year. The hon. Member for Cambridge University took the same view, and he took the Estimates for 1897; and to-day the hon. Member for Oldham took the year 1898. The argument about each of these three years was exactly the same, viz., that there had been a great additional extravagance. They were getting a smaller proportion of men for the extra proportion of money. The extra proportion of men was 27½ per cent. and the extra proportion of money was something like 57 per cent. This was a serious point, to which not a single answer had been given, and every item had been greatly increased. One of the most astounding items was for miscellaneous regimental charges, which had been put down at £10,000, although £100 was considered sufficient three or four years ago. This showed the reckless way in which the whole of the Estimates had been prepared. This particular Vote was the only one upon which they were free from any detail, and upon which they could express their views that too much money was being taken. He could not understand why hon. Members were content to devote only the portion of one sitting to this great Vote. The only instructive speech they had had that afternoon was that made by the hon. Member for Oldham, who treated the matter from a broad standpoint. His hon. friend the Member for Northampton had made a consistent proposal which had been supported by eloquent speeches from hon. Gentlemen opposite, and if they did not support this motion their action would be very inconsistent.

Sir JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said that what was objected to by hon. Members on this side of the House was not the pay, but that they objected to having so many men, and therefore yesterday they voted to reduce the number. The Committee was against them, however, by a large majority, and voted the number of men asked for. The decision of the Committee having been given in this way, it was perfectly logical to say that as the Committee had voted the men they must now pay them.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said that if the Committee did not vote the money now, the Government would not be able to get the men.

Sir JOHN GORST said the Government had the authority of the Committee to raise the men, and therefore it would be unreasonable now to refuse them the pay for those men. It was on those grounds that a number of his hon. friends voted against the Motion yesterday, but they were prepared now to vote for the Government's proposal to-day.

Mr. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) said that this amendment gave the Committee an opportunity of changing its mind with respect to what it did last night. [Cries of "Divide, divide!"] If the pay was not voted the men would not be engaged, and the object which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge

University had in view when he opposed the Vote for the men would be attained. This Vote afforded the Committee a second opportunity of deciding the same question. If the right hon. Gentleman opposite now ran away from his position the only thing to conclude was that he was wanting in political courage and was anxious to make peace with the Government.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER said the number of men voted was always greatly in excess of the actual numbers kept. It had almost invariably been the case that the number of men——

*Mr. BRODRICK: The number is taken from the average.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER said the number of men taken was not really controlled by the Vote taken yesterday, but by the Vote taken to-day. It had always been so, and the Vote being taken now was what controlled the average number of men. Those who wished to reduce the actual number of men ought therefore to vote for this Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 80 Noes, 223. (Division List No. 25.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (*Rhondda*)
Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)
Allen, Chas. P. (*Glos., Stroud*)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (*Derbyshire*)
Bell, Richard
Blake, Edward
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing. Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter (*Lanark*
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (*Carmarthen*)
Douglas, Charles M. (*Lanark*)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (*Bristl, E*
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Kearley, Hudson E.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (*Accrington*)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (*Cornwall*)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (*Carmarthen*)
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir C. M. (*Durham*)
Partington, Oswald
Pirie, Duncan V.
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Roberts, John Bryn (*Eifion*)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbt. L. (*Cleveland*)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (*Hawick, B.*)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (*Forfarshire*)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt. HnC. R (*Northants*
Tennant, Harold John
Thomson, F. W. (*York, W. R.*)
Tomkinson, James
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (*Barnsley*)
Wason, E. (*Clackmannan*)
Wason, John Cathcart (*Orkney*
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (*Norfolk*)
Whitley, J. H. (*Halifax*)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, H. J. (*York, W. R.*)
Wilson, John (*Durham, Mid*)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (*Huddersf'd*

Tellers for the Ayes—
Mr. Labouchere and Mr.
Courtenay Warner.

NOES

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Aug. Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (*Man'r*
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (*Hornsey*
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (*Leeds*
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Fras. T. (*Windsor*)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benj.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alx. H. (*Shropsh.*)
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn J A (*Glasg.*)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (*N. Lancs.*)
Cavendish, V C W (*Derbysh.*)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J A (*Worc*
Chamberlayne, T. (*Southmptn*
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Right Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Cox, Irwin Edwd. Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, H. Shepherd (*Bolton*)

Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Ed.
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (*Man'r*
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H (*City of Lond*
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (*St. Albans*
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (*Linc*
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Graham, Henry Robert
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld. G. (*Midx*
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Hardy, Laurence (*Kent, Ashfd*
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (*Salop*
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (*Glasgow*
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (*Monm'th*)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, A. H. (*Hants, Fareham*)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Long, Col. Chas. W. (*Evesham*
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (*Bristol, S.*
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (*Wigt'n*
Maxwell, W J H (*Dumfriesshire*
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William
Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (*Hants.*
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (*Shropshire*
Morgan, D. J. (*Walthamstow*)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robt. Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (*Bute*
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (*Salisbury*)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (*Greenock*)
Remnant, Jas. Farquharson
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W (*Stalybridge*
Ridley, S. F. (*Bethnal Green*)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (*Sheffield*)
Robertson, H. (*Hackney*)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (*Liverpool*)
Sadler, Col. Saml. Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.
Scott, Sir S. (*Marylebone, W.*)
Seely, Chas. Hilton (*Lincoln*)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (*Isle of Wight*
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (*Renfrew*)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (*Romford*)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, H. C (*North'mb. Tyneside*
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (*Strand*)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (*W. Bromwich*)
Stanley, Hon. A. (*Ormskirk*)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (*Somerset*)
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir Jn. M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hn. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (*Chichester*)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (*Oxf'd Univ*
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. E. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H. *Sheffield*
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Webb, Col. William George
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (*Notts*)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. S. (*York, E. R.*)
Wilson, John (*Falkirk*)
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (*Yorks.*)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (*Bath*
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Whereupon MR. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 208; Noes 61. (Division List No. 26.)

AYES.

Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Aug. Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (*Man'r*
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (*Hornsey*
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (*Leeds*
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benj.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alx. H. (*Shropsh.*)
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn J A (*Glasg.*)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V C W (*Derbysh.*)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J A (*Worc*
Chamberlayne, T. (*Southmptn*
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Right Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Cox, Irwin Edwd. Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, H. Shepherd (*Bolton*)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Ed.
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (*Man'r*
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H (*City of Lond*
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (*St. Albans*
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Graham, Henry Robert
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld. G. (*Midx*
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (*Salop*
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (*Glasgow*
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (*Monm'th*)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, A. H. (*Hants, Fareham*)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Long, Col. Chas. W. (*Evesham*
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (*Bristol, S.*
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (*Wigt'n*
Maxwell, W J H (*Dumfriesshire*
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William
Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (*Hants*
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (*Shropshire*
Morgan, D. J. (*Walthamstow*)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robt. Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (*Bute*
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Palmer, Walter (*Salisbury*)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (*Greenock*)
Remnant, Jas. Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (*Stalybridge*
Ridley, S. F. (*Bethnal Green*)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (*Sheffield*)
Robertson, H. (*Hackney*)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (*Liverpool*)
Sadler, Col. Saml. Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.
Scott, Sir S. (*Marylebone, W.*)
Seely, Charles Hilton (*Lincoln*
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (*Isle of Wight*
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (*Renfrew*)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, H C (*North'mb. Tyneside*
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (*Strand*
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (*W. Bromwich*)
Stanley, Hon. A. (*Ormskirk*)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (*Somerset*)
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir Jn. M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hn.-Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (*Chichester*)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (*Oxf. Univ.*
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. E. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (*Sheffield*
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Webb, Col. William George
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (*Notts*)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. S. (*York, E. R.*)
Wilson, John (*Falkirk*)
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (*Yorks.*)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (*Bath*
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (*Rhondda*)
Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)
Barlow, John Emmott
Bell, Richard
Blake, Edward
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Burns, John

Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter (*Lanark*
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Douglas, Charles M. (*Lanark*)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Flynn, James Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (*Bristol, N.*
Labouchere, Henry
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (*Accrington*)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lough, Thomas
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (*Carmarthen*
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir C. M. (*Durham*)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Roberts, John Bryn (*Eifion*)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbt. L. (*Cleveland*)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (*Hawick, B.*)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Tennant, Harold John
Thomson, F. W. (*York, W. R.*)
Tomkinson, James
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (*Barnsley*)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Wason, E. (*Clackmannan*)
Wason, J. Cathcart (*Orkney*)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (*Norfolk*)
Whitley, J. H. (*Halifax*)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, H. J. (*York, W. R.*)
Wilson, John (*Durham, Mid*)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Robert Spencer and Mr. John Sinclair.

Original Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 202; Noes, 53. (Division List No. 27.)

AYES.

Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Aug. Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (*Man'r*
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (*Hornsey*
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (*Leeds*
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benj.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alx. H. (*Shropsh.*)
Campbell, Rt Hn J A (*Glasg*)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V C W (*Derbysh.*)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (*Greenwich*)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J A (*Worc*
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Right Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Cox, Irwin Edwd. Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, H. Shepherd (*Bolton*)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Ed.
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (*Man'r*
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H (*City of Lond*
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (*St. Albans*
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Graham, Henry Robert
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld. G. (*Midx*
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (*Salop*
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (*Glasgow*
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (*Monm'th*)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, A. H. (*Hants, Fareham*)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Long, Col. Chas. W. (*Evesham*
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (*Bristol, S.*
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (*Wigt'n*
Maxwell, W. J. H. (*Dumfriessh.*
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William
Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (*Hants.*
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (*Walthamstow*)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robt. Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (*Bute*
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Palmer, Walter (*Salisbury*)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert

Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (*Greenock*)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (*Stalybridge*
Ridley, S. Forde (*Bethnal Green*
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (*Sheffield*)
Robertson, Herbert (*Hackney*)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (*Liverpool*)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (*Marylebone, W.*)
Seely, Charles Hilton (*Lincoln*)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (*Isle of Wight*
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (*Renfrew*)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, H. C. (*North'mb. Tyneside*
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (*Strand*)
Spencer, Sir E. (*W. Bromwich*
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (*Ormskirk*
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (*Somerset*)
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir Jn. M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (*Chichester*)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J G. (*Oxf'd Univ.*
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn Sir William H
Webb, Col. William George
Welby, Sir Charles G E. (*Notts.*
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (*York, E. R.*)
Wilson, John (*Falkirk*)
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (*Yorks.*)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (*Bath*)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (*Rhondda*)
Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)
Barlow, John Emmott
Bell, Richard
Blake, Edward
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter (*Lanark*)
Cremer, William Randal
Douglas, Charles M. (*Lanark*)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Labouchere, Henry
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (*Accrington*)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lough, Thomas
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (*Durham*
Pirie, Duncan V.
Rea, Russell
Roberts, John Bryn (*Eifion*)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbert L. (*Cleveland*)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (*Hawick, B.*)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Tennant, Harold John
Thomson, F. W. (*York, W. R.*)
Tomkinson, James
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (*Barnsley*)
Wason, Eugene (*Clackmannan*
Wason, John Cathcart (*Orkney*)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (*Norfolk*)
Whitley, J. H. (*Halifax*)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, H. J. (*York, W. R.*)
Wilson, John (*Durham, Mid.*)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Robert Spencer and Mr. John Sinclair.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

BRISTOL, LONDON, AND SOUTHERN COUNTIES RAILWAY BILL (BY ORDER).

Read a second time, and committed.

CITY AND NORTH-EAST SUBURBAN ELECTRIC RAILWAY BILL (BY ORDER).

Order for Second Reading read.

*MR. D. J. MORGAN (Essex, Walthamstow) said this was not a new Bill to the House. The routes proposed were strongly recommended by the Joint Committee of this House and the House of Lords in 1901. This line would commence with the Tube Station in the City under Gracechurch Street, at or near Eastcheap, opposite the Monument Station of the Metropolitan District and Metropolitan Railway, with which and with the City and South London Railway convenient exchanges of passengers could be secured by means of underground passages. And here he would mention that Railways 5 and 6 in the Bill would be withdrawn; they were deposited to provide a short extension from the Monument to the Mansion House. The line would then proceed under Gracechurch Street and Bishopsgate Street to the City boundary. Two other City stations, making three in all, would be provided at (1) Cornhill, where a site has been chosen 300 yards from the Royal Exchange, and (2) at Liverpool Street, where excellent exchange arrangements could be made with the Metropolitan Railway at their Bishopsgate Station (and with the Central London Railway when their proposed "extension to Liverpool

Street" was complete at their Liverpool Street Station). The line then passed under High Street, Shoreditch, stations being placed at Shoreditch, opposite the Bishopsgate Station of the Great Eastern Railway, and at the junction of Hackney Road and High Street. Here the main line is divided into two, one line running due north to Tottenham and Chequer's Green, and the other in a north-easterly direction to Leyton, Walthamstow, Chingford, and Waltham Abbey for Epping Forest. This point of divergence was about 1⅛ miles from the commencement of the main line. The Tottenham line would run in tube under public streets through the boroughs of Shoreditch, Hackney, Stoke Newington, and the urban district of Tottenham to a point 4¾ miles from Hackney Road, where it passed into the open and thence to its termination at Chequer's Green.

Stations would be provided on the railway in the tube at Kingsland Road, Stamford Road, Arcola Street, Stoke Newington, Cazenove Road, Stamford Hill, Seven Sisters Road, and on the railway in the open at the Avenue, Tottenham, Lordship Lane, White Hart Lane and Chequer's Green. At Lordship Lane and White Hart Lane the line would conveniently tap the building estate of the London County Council, upon which 48,000 people of the artizan classes were to be housed. The total distance from the Monument to Chequer's Green would be about seven and three quarter miles. The Waltham Abbey Line from its point of divergence passed in tube through the boroughs of Bethnal Green, Hackney, mostly under public streets, but partly under the Victoria Park, to a point about two and three quarter miles from its commencement, where it became an open air railway, and passed through the Urban Districts of Leyton, Walthamstow, Chingford, and Walthamstow, Holy Cross, terminating at Waltham Abbey. Length of line in open being about thirteen miles. In the tube four stations would be provided, at Haggerston, Cambridge Road, Victoria Park, Hackney, whilst in the open twelve stations would be provided at Temple Mills (where the Great Eastern works were), Leyton, Brewster Road, Lea Bridge Road, Walthamstow, Forest Road, Higham Hill, Chingford Hall, Chingford Green, Gillwell Park, Royal Oak, High Beech and Waltham Abbey. This line thus passed through the territory of twelve local authorities outside the City, all of which had passed resolutions in favour of its being constructed as promptly as possible, because it would greatly help the districts of Bethnal Green, Whitechapel, Shoreditch, Hackney, and Spitalfields, where congestion of population rendered easier means of getting the people out of London a most pressing question. Many hon. Members of this House knew what this state of overcrowding meant. There were many places where there were three families living in one room, and there were many other instances of an enormous number of tenements which were occupied by more than one family. It would be allowed by everybody that there was immense need for relieving this overcrowding by giving these people facilities to come out into the country and so enable them to live under healthier and better conditions.

Another reason why this railway should not be delayed was because the present railway accommodation at Walthamstow and Leyton and Tottenham was quite inadequate at the time when a large portion of the working population—and in Walthamstow and Leyton alone the population amounts to over 200,000 people—required to be carried to and from its work in the morning and evening. The Urban District Councils of Walthamstow and Leyton most earnestly requested by resolution that the House will let this Bill go through with all speed, because the new colony of 48,000 people who will inhabit the buildings near Lordship Lane and White Hart Lane, which will be erected for the London County Council, will want additional facilities to get to and from their work owing to the inadequate means adopted by the Great Eastern Railway. This he did not think the hon. Member for Battersea would deny. Between Walthamstow and Waltham Abbey from 9,000 to 11,000 acres of splendid building land, on ground backed by Epping Forest, and sloping down to the River Lea, offered splendid sites for the erection of workmen's houses, for which it is eminently fitted, because it could be acquired at a price per acre which would enable workmen's dwellings to be erected at a cost which should permit their being let at rents which were moderate. That was one of the most essential things in erecting houses for the working classes, because unless they got land cheap it was impossible to erect houses at a cost which would permit them to be let at a rent which working men can afford to pay. The great difficulty in the housing question was to provide houses for those people who were receiving small and casual wages, say of 20s. to 23s. a week, and who could not afford to pay the rents of modern dwellings where the price of the land was high.

Another reason why he hoped the House would not refuse a Second Reading to this Bill, but would allow it to go to a Committee, was that by Clause 114 of the present Bill the obligation would be imposed upon the Company of carrying third class passengers from London to Tottenham and Walthamstow respectively for 2d. (being, for a distance of over six miles, less than one-third of a penny per mile), while under Clause 121 workmen return tickets are issued up till seven o'clock a.m., at fares which should not exceed the single fare above stated. It might be mentioned here that the traffic arrangements of the Company provided for a two and a half minutes service of trains from the Monument, giving a five minutes service to Tottenham, and a five minutes service to Walthamstow. This Company was also willing to give facilities for the conveyance of workmen's tools by workmen's trains, which was one of the difficulties which had to be provided for at present. The Great Eastern Railway had done much, very much, to meet the railway requirements of the neighbourhoods through which its line passed, but it could not do more at present, it was impossible to run more trains. The population in Tottenham, Walthamstow, Leyton, and Chingford, was increasing weekly, and further railway accommodation was needed now, and it would be much more needed in the near future.

The present over-crowding in the Great Eastern Railway trains, morning and evening, he knew of from personal experience. This morning, from 6.28 till 8.28, he watched the trains leaving Walthamstow, Hoe Street, and James Street. The trains were frightfully overcrowded; people were waiting on the platform five and seven deep, and when he came through from Hoe Street, Walthamstow, he came in a carriage constructed to carry ten passengers and there were twenty-one in it. It was not only the difficulty of getting to work in the morning, but of getting down in the evening at the hours at which they were to get home. The overcrowding of the trains then was so excessive that it was difficult to get a place at all. He went down the other day with twenty-two workmen in a guard's van, because there was no room anywhere else. This matter was one on which the people of the East End felt keenly, and they felt that there was now an opportunity for this House to show that it was willing to do what it could to relieve these difficulties. The suggestion to hang up this railway until after the Report of the Royal Commissioners was one which he hoped the House would not agree to. This railway was on a very different footing to many of the deep tubes which had been proposed, and which were part of a great system for London. This railway went a very short way through the City of London, from the Monument to the limits of the City, and stood, so he maintained, on quite a different footing to those which formed part of the great scheme of tube railways proposed. If this line was delayed, all he could say was that the difficulties and troubles which now existed would be ever so much greater. The fact that this line passed through twelve localities, the Councils of which were unanimous in its favour, showed the feeling in this matter, and he appealed to the Members of this House to let this Bill go to a Committee, and thereby help forward one of the best schemes for enabling our working people to get quickly and cheaply into better air and better dwellings. He begged to move that this Bill be read a second time

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. VICARY GIBBS (Hertfortshire, St. Albans) in moving that this Bill be read a second time this day six months, said the hon. Member had said there had been much overcrowding on the Great Eastern Railway this morning, and that he came up to town in a carriage in which there were twenty-one other passengers. The reason of that was that there was a thick fog, and for reasons of safety thirteen trains which would have carried this traffic were cancelled. The point he wished to urge on this House was, that there was nothing to distinguish this particular Bill from the other Bills which the President of the Board of Trade had held over. He submitted that the reason they ought to hold this Bill over was, that they must not interfere in any way with the Royal Commission which was now sitting to consider the question of London traffic. It was perfectly clear that this Bill was in the same category as those which had been suspended by the President of the Board of Trade, and he should wait with great interest to see what it was that the President of the Board of Trade would have to say in explanation of making this differentiation in favour of this Bill. This Bill proposed to have not exactly a terminus station, but the last station but one in the mouth of Threadneedle Street, which was the most restricted and inconvenient portion of that street for the traffic of London to negotiate. The crowd of pedestrians there was frightfully in excess of the accommodation for them at the moment, and it was now proposed by this Bill to throw crowds into Threadneedle Street in the course of the day without any arrangements being made for their safety, or for the necessary alterations that would have to be made at that particular part. That was a very reasonable ground for this Bill not being accepted at this particular moment.

His position in this matter was, that besides all the other sins which this Bill would commit, it would take away his own office in the City, and he would probably obtain a large sum of money which he would not otherwise get, and which he did not want, as against what he regarded as the public convenience. They had heard a great deal of people who were shareholders in companies not voting, and he asked for the guidance of Mr. Speaker as to what he should do. He wanted to vote against this Bill, but if Mr. Speaker said it was against the etiquette of the House, he should abstain. He did not know that he was called upon to abstain if he regarded this Bill as a public evil, but on that he desired to have guidance.

*MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid this is not a point upon which I can give a ruling. The question whether a vote should be allowed or disallowed can only arise after the vote has been given, and can only be decided by the House itself. Having heard the hon. Member's description of the circumstances in which he stands, I doubt very much whether any hon. Member of this House would quarrel with his vote if he gave one upon this Bill.

MR. VICARY GIBBS: That being so, Sir, I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time this day six months.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Vicary Gibbs.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham): I cannot pretend that I should gain or lose money through the passing of this Bill, but I am prepared to vote with the hon. Member for St. Albans upon this matter for this reason. The Bill proposes to give communication with certain towns which are already in communication with London, and which already have an exceptionally good service of trains. It is quite possible that as everybody wants to travel at the same time on the Great Eastern Railway, there may be some overcrowding at that time. The reason which influences me in opposing this Bill is that the Government have appointed a Royal Commission to consider the question of the traffic of London, and the means or method of improving the ingress and egress thereto. My right hon. friend the Member for Walthamstow, who sits upon my right, says that this railway does not interfere with the City, because it only goes a short distance into the City; but the City is a very small area, and if you have a railway going a mile or half-a-mile into the City that interferes just as much with the City as any other railway going three or four miles in the West End would interfere with the West End. I was just going to point out that this Bill does interfere with the City very much. I would ask my hon. friend whether he does not agree with me that one of the greatest thoroughfares in the City is Gracechurch Street. Well, they have Gracechurch Street for their starting-point, then the line runs under King William Street, Threadneedle Street, and Bishopsgate Street. I do not know any five streets in the City of London which are more important than those five, and therefore I think it is ridiculous to say that this Bill does not interfere with the City of London; that argument absolutely falls to the ground. I would point out, so far as I understand it, what is actually to be done. Where a Bill is brought in now which merely gives slightly increased facilities to a line that exists, that Bill is not sent before the Royal Commission, but considered on its merits, and is allowed to pass—but where a Bill, a new Bill, is brought in which proposes to make sixteen miles of new railway that Bill is referred to the Royal Commission. I am not interested either directly or indirectly in this Bill, but it seems to me that if the Royal Commission is not to be a farce it is most important a Bill to create new Railways should be referred to it, and not be passed by this House to-day.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said he rose to support the Motion made by the two hon. Members who had just addressed the House for the rejection of this Bill, for reasons in addition to those which they had advanced. His opposition to this Bill to-day was not due to individual captiousness on his part, but that, as a representative of the London County Council, which was, on this particular matter, the chief sanitary and housing authority of this vast city, he considered it desirable, in the interests of London locomotion as a whole, and in the interest of housing conditions, and of obtaining cheaper and better railway fares of every description, that this Bill should be considered by the Royal Commission which was now sitting. Last year there were fifteen Tube Bills introduced into this House for the purpose mainly of making London a "Tom Tidler's ground" out of which the Americans were to pick up all the gold and silver. The House of Commons then said we have no right to allow irresponsible promoters to come here and promote, in our Metropolis, unconnected railways, uncoordinated with existing systems of railways and tram lines. Notwithstanding that those fifteen railway schemes had at their disposal the best parliamentary lawyers, draughtsmen and financiers, the House of Commons over-rode the Pierpont-Morgan method of lobbying, and after one of the most remarkable debates that he had ever listened to in this House, it said London was already too much confused with railway schemes, and it could not be subject to endless interference by irresponsible promoters of these Bills. The House of Commons resisted the blandishments of Pierpont-Morgan, Yerkes & Co., and decided to do this. They declined to allow the Metropolis to remain a place of exploitation by railway companies without some recognition of the control of this House. and they practically rejected the bulk of these Bills. Why did they do that? They did it because there was a general growing feeling on all sides of the House that it was not more railways that London wanted, but that the existing railways should have forced upon them some process of amalgamation in order that the systems might be co-ordinated.

It was said "Get your running powers, and if you do that we will do our best to help you," and in that spirit the House of Commons rejected a majority of those Bills. Why, because they are sustained by the decision of the Government Department, which felt, like the County Council of London and every other public authority in London, that the present system of communication could not go on much longer, and that they had got to devise some permanent and definite plan by which the various systems could be harmonised. The House was compelled to throw out some of these Bills. The House did so on the promise of the Government Department that before next session a Royal Commission would be appointed. The Royal Commission had been created, and to it these Bills were to be remitted for consideration and report. A number of Bills had been introduced, but very curiously the Bill which of all others ought to be remitted to the Royal Commission was being exempted from the purview of that Commission. The result was, that the Royal Commission instituted to enquire into London locomotion, of which this Bill was the chief section, would be, like Othello, with its occupation gone. He asked the House to remember this fact. It was proposed to exempt from the purview of the Royal Commission in this case twenty-two and a half miles of Electric Railway. That in itself was more than all the other railways referred to in the schemes which would go to the Commission. The *raison d'être* for this Commission would thus be removed, and if they did not remit this Bill to the Commission, they might as well open the door and let the others go through at the same time. This Commission was appointed to consider the whole question of locomotion in the Metropolis, and this Bill referred to the chief railway which should be remitted to the Commission for consideration. He asked, therefore, that this Bill should be suspended until the Royal Commission presented its report.

He trusted that the House would understand his position in this matter. He had no special objection to this particular Bill, on that matter he was willing to defer to the Royal Commission. He had no technical objection to the plans which had been deposited. He was not entitled to speak on that particular point. All he wished was to defer to the well informed Commission which would have experts to give proper evidence before it, but he did say that to appoint a Royal Commission and then to withhold from it what ought to be the chief part of its work was making this Commission a farce, stultifying its ultimate labours, and, incidentally, trying to make a fool of the House of Commons. He objected to that being done. Now they came to this particular railway. This railway proposed to traverse a route from Gracechurch Street in the City to Tottenham, by way of Stoke Newington, a distance of eight miles. The hon. Member who moved the Second Reading of the Bill was under the impression that it did not in any way interfere with the convenience of the City a great deal, but when there were five of the principal streets in the City interfered with, and when they remembered that the City was only one square mile in extent, it was no answer to say that it only interfered with five streets. The area of the City being one square mile, practically three-quarters of the City was invaded. In the interests of public convenience as a whole he was prepared to invade the City, and some day the County Council would have to capture it, lock, stock and barrel. It was proposed also that there should be a branch line to Walthamstow and Waltham Abbey. Just fancy a railway proposed to go under Kensington Gardens and Hyde Park. That would be regarded as sufficient to warrant a special instruction to safeguard the public interests in connection with Hyde Park and other open spaces in the West End. If that would be done for the West End, why not for the East End also? Why should Victoria Park, and any other open spaces there might be on the route, not have proper safeguards. He said that they were not the proper body to consider the Bill at this moment. The proper body was the Royal Commission appointed to go into these matters, but incidentally he would say that the proper body to safeguard these open spaces was the County Council, which objected to this Bill going on until the Commission presented its report.

His next point was perhaps a very good one. This railway, so far as he was able to observe, was only a slight modification and amalgamation of the City and North East London Railways, which were proposed by Mr. Pierpont Morgan last year in Bills which were thrown out. The reason that induced the House to throw out these Bills last year was a reason why they should not pass this particular one. Indeed this Bill was not in some respects as good as the two which were promoted last year. There was this advantage in the scheme last year, of which this was only a truncated portion—it connected

Walthamstow with Piccadilly and Hammersmith, and the railways proposed by the two Bills last year did carry a person from Hammersmith to Piccadilly and then by way of the City to Walthamstow. They had a through route and reasonable rates were imposed on the Pierpont Morgan group. But this Bill does not provide for a railway to Piccadilly and Hammersmith. It abandoned the through route and the fares were not so good as those proposed by last year's Bill. The Bill went before Lord Windsor's Committee, and that Committee rejected it in so far as it related to the scheme between the Mansion House and Whitechapel, which this particular scheme happened to be a portion of. He wanted to put this to the House of Commons. The Bill practically failed on account of the dropping out of the most important section—between Hammersmith and the City. What was left of this particular Bill was repudiated by Lord Windsor's Committee and rejected by the House of Commons.

When they remembered that out of forty miles of electric railway this particular scheme had twenty-two miles, it appeared to him that, as the greater rules the lesser, it should not be proceeded with, if anyone was going to have a through route from Hammersmith to the City, and thence to Tottenham, Walthamstow and Waltham Abbey. He ventured to say that it would be better for this House to impose that through route upon the existing Tube railways and upon the Great Eastern Railway, or some Company that was doing part of the work now—if they liked, inefficiently—with larger capital, greater knowledge and experience of this part of the Metropolis than this newly-fledged syndicate could hope to command. If this proposal went before the Commission it would be found that the Great Eastern Railway submitted to a Committee in 1901 practically this scheme, occupying much of the same route, and it would have done the woık in a better way than the promoters of this Bill could ever hope to do it.

Might he appeal to the House of Commons to rise above the local reasons which had induced some hon. members to support this Bill? The House of Commons was a national assembly; it was not a congress of Borough Councils and vestrymen, or representatives of local areas. It was a national assembly for the determination of both national and metropolitan questions on broad, not to say Imperial, lines. The only reason for this Bill being supported was that some local Members had thought that parochial considerations warranted them in supporting it, and local reasons alone have been adduced to justify their action. He was going to sacrifice his personal interests on the altar of Metropolitan duty. The district which he represented had two Tube Bills, which were to be brought before the House this session. One was for the construction of a tube railway connecting Clapham Junction with the Marble Arch, whence passengers could go to other places by another route. It would be convenient for the people of Battersea to have these two tube railways, but it would be selfish, exclusive, and unpatriotic for Battersea to promote its own sectional interests independent of the general considerations of Metropolitan interests and the traffic of London as a whole. He was going to ask the House of Commons to throw out these two Bills on the broad ground that he asked them to throw out this one, which was that it served only local interests and was not generally asked for, while it was opposed by the authority that, in his opinion, was the best judge on matters of locomotion — namely, the County Council.

His next point was this: What had the hon. Member who moved the Bill done to-night? He said that Railways 5 and 6 were withdrawn. No reason had been advanced why 5 and 6 are withdrawn. Was it to suit the convenience of the promoters, and was it because by taking that course they were pursuing the line of least resistance? Why were they cutting them out? Possibly, for anything they knew, Railways 5 and 6 might go through greatly congested districts, and probably they would be the two parts of the Bill the Royal Commission would keep in. It was really amusing to hear hon. Members who were opposed to the housing policy of the London County Council dragging in that Council to-night by the scruff of the neck as a reason why this Bill should be passed. It was true that a policy for the housing of the working classes had been gone into by the London County Council, and that it had been enabled to establish at

Tottenham a scheme that would give house accommodation to 42,000 people; but he put it to the House of Commons: Was the authority that had done this work, and which was responsible to Parliament for the carrying of it out, going to cut off these 42,000 of the community from easy communication with the City? Was it going deliberately to depreciate its housing scheme by depriving the people of proper facilities for transit? The County Council thought that if this particular company got this Bill for a railway from the City to Tottenham, it would have an exclusive monopoly to serve that community without regard to their relationship to the other railway companies which were prepared to do the work. Probably that community would have dearer fares, fewer trains, and worse accommodation than they would have if the housing scheme was brought before the Royal Commission. They would be better served by that Commission than by this House if the subject came before the Commission for consideration. The Member for Walthamstow dragged in the question of overcrowding, and referred to a case where three families were living in one room, with an average wage of 15s. a week. But the question of overcrowding was not met by this particular Bill. The hon. Member expressed the hope that this Bill would not be removed from the purview of the Royal Commission.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. A. BONAR LAW, Glasgow, Blackfriars) said he did not propose to follow the hon. Member who had just sat down into his argument in so far as it was a plea for the rights of property. The bulk of his speech was based on what he believed to be an entirely erroneous impression. He spoke of referring this Bill and the other Bills to the Royal Commission which had been appointed. The Royal Commission had not been appointed to consider special Bills, and the promoters of this Bill would have absolutely no right to insist that the Commission should consider it.

MR. JOHN BURNS knew that the hon. Gentleman would pardon him for interrupting him. He was aware that the Royal Commission had not been appointed to consider this special Bill, and that it had been appointed to consider the general question of London locomotion, of which this Bill was a prominent part.

*MR. A. BONAR LAW said that was what he stated. It had been appointed to consider the general question of locomotion in the Metropolis. He would try to explain later on the grounds on which his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade considered that this Bill should be dealt with by this House. If he was not mistaken, the London County Council, for whom the hon. Member for Battersea had been speaking to-day, actually approved of this Bill two years ago. He had tried very earnestly to gather the grounds on which the hon. Gentleman opposed it now. It appeared to him that he stated no ground except that he objected to this Bill because there were certain other Bills in which he was more directly interested, which were not allowed to be considered by a Committee upstairs. He appealed to hon. Members, and to the House, if that was not the policy of the dog in the manger. Now all this was apart from the important question which the House had to decide. He quite admitted that his right hon. friend in appointing this Royal Commission, did intend that in the meantime nothing should be done to interfere with the general scheme which that Commission might place before Parliament with reference to London locomotion. At the very time that he moved for the appointment of a Royal Commission, that appointment was objected to by some hon. Members on the other side of the House. And his right hon. friend was asked: "Do you mean to say that until the Commission has reported no Bill will ever be considered by the House?" His answer then was: "Of course any Bills that are brought before the House will be considered on their merits, and especially with reference to the point whether or not they will interfere with the general plan or scheme for the whole of the Metropolis." The principle on which his right hon. friend had acted was a simple one. In considering what Bills should be allowed, and what Bills should not be allowed, to go upstairs, he had been influenced to some small extent by the urgent needs for particular Bills which might be brought forward.

In connection with this particular Bill he himself received a deputation in support of it. That deputation consisted of representatives of every one of the local authorities affected by the Bill, and was supported by the Members of Parliament in every district through which the railway was to pass, and they urged the need of the Bill, and the necessity of greater accommodation being provided by the district. Even the hon. Member for St. Albans, who had a special case to plead that day, and some other Members, stated that they had travelled in first-class carriages on the Great Eastern Railway in which there were three or four times more people than the carriages were built to accommodate. That, however, was not the main consideration which influenced his hon. friend. The main consideration was whether this Bill would interfere with the general plan or scheme for the whole of London of the Royal Commission. He might say at once that when the deputation saw him he pointed out that they must consider that point, and that if this Bill would interfere with the general plan, it was almost certain that it would be thrown out. That was the ground on which his right hon. friend had chiefly considered this Bill. He had considered it with the assistance of the best expert advice at the disposal of the Department, and the conclusion arrived at was, that it was not a Bill which would interfere with the general plan to be recommended by the Royal Commission. That was the conclusion to which his right hon. friend had come, and in that he was supported by the Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords, and by the Deputy-Chairman of that House; but in spite of that, his right hon. friend did not claim that he had necessarily come to a correct judgment on that point. Without more evidence than they had at the present moment, it was impossible to be sure that the Bill would not interfere with such a general plan for London. They did not ask that the Bill should be passed; all they asked was that it should be allowed to go upstairs and be considered by the Committee there. The House knew the importance of a general plan for London, and if this Bill interfered with that general plan, the sufferers would be the promoters of the Bill. On those grounds he hoped sincerely that the Second Reading would be allowed to pass.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said he had had the same difficulty in placing his vote as the hon. Member for St. Albans, because if this Bill had been passed two or three years ago it would have considerably benefited him. He thought, however, he might have a free hand on this particular point, although the hon. Gentleman might have a nicer conscience than he had. He would point out that this was the only line ever proposed for this particular district, except one mentioned by the hon. Member for Battersea, which had been suggested by the Great Eastern Company, but which was never promoted. It was dropped as soon as the complications ceased. The line did not compete with any other line, and it was absurd to say that it could compete with the Great Eastern, because it was admitted that that Company had more traffic offered to them than they could carry. He remembered seeing a photograph of the state of a workmen's train ten years ago, in which the over-crowding was so manifest that the suggestion that the Great Eastern Company could carry the traffic was put down at once. If that could be said ten years ago, when the traffic was not half what it now was, it could be more powerfully urged at the present day. As this was the only line it was possible to make, all that was required was that proper safeguards should be put in by the Committee as to fares, and as to communications at the end of the line with any other line which might be built in future. The necessity of the line was so great, and he could testify to that because he knew the district well, that the House should give some relief, and allow the Committee upstairs to say whether or not it was the fact that the urgency of the case demanded that this Bill should not be defeated.

*MR. FORDE RIDLEY (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said he wished to look at this question, not only from a local but a national point of view. The population which it was proposed to help by this railway amounted to no less than about a million persons. He held that this scheme had certain things about it which made it entirely different from other schemes which had come before the House. Overlapping had been very much considered, but in this case overlapping did not occur. This railway, which was almost identical with the scheme proposed by the Great Eastern Company some years ago, but which was dropped when they found no opposition, was absolutely essential if the people were to be housed in the outlying districts. Why, the London County Council now proposed to house 148,000 people in this district, and there should be some additional means of transit in order to take them to and from various parts of London. The Great Eastern Company had done all that was possible for them to do to convey the people, but they admitted that it was impossible to carry more than they did at present. Hon. Members might have heard during recent months what hardships had been borne by the working classes by being brought into London hours before they had to go to work. Temporary sheds had been erected for their shelter, and in some cases the churches had been thrown open in order to prevent these poor people tramping about the streets in all weathers before they went to work. Why was it that there was this state of things? It was because the Great Eastern Company could not deal with the traffic, although they had gone the length of widening their rolling stock in order to carry more persons than at present. The trains had to be sent back to the suburbs to bring in the clerk element, who had to be in their offices between nine and ten o'clock, and so it was impossible for the Great Eastern Company to run workmen's trains at a later hour in the morning than at present.

There were exceptional reasons why this Bill should be allowed to proceed without being hung up in Committee upstairs. If hon. Members wanted to convince themselves of the inconvenience to which the public are put, he advised them to take a journey in the early morning and see for themselves what the condition of affairs was. The hon. Member for Battersea suggested that the first and second class carriages should be thrown open to the working men; he was authorised to state, by one who knew the facts, that already third class passengers were allowed to travel in second class carriages, and that women and children were allowed to travel in first class carriages. He hoped the House would not look at this matter solely from the local point of view. He was speaking for 130,000 people who dwelt in his own constituency, but the local authorities of all the East-End districts of London were unanimously in favour of this Bill, which he thought should be allowed to proceed as quickly as possible.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 162; Noes, 60. (Division List No. 28.)

AYES.

Abraham, W. (*Cork, N.E.*)
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)
Allhusen, Aug. Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther, H. T.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. H. Sir H.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (*Man-*
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (*Hornsey*
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (*Leeds*
Bell, Richard
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bousfield, William Robert
Brigg, John
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Caldwell James
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V C W (*Derbysh.*)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J A (*Worc*
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Right Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Cranborne, Viscount
Cremer, William Randal
Cross, H. Shepherd (*Bolton*)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Davies, M. Vaughan- (*Cardign*
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Douglas, Charles M. (*Lanark*)
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Ffrench, Peter
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William

Gilhooly, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Graham, Henry Robert
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld. G. (*Midx*
Hardy, Laurence (*Kent, Ashfd*
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Helme, Norval Watson
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (*Bristl, E*
Howard, J. (*Midd., Tott'ham*
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Joicey, Sir James
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Kitson, Sir James
Knowles, Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (*Glasgow*
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (*Monm'th*)
Lawson, John Grant
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lees, Sir Joseph F. (*Accrington*)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (*Evesham*
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (*Bristol, S.*

Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (*Liverpool*)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Crae, George
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (*Wigt'n*
Maxwell W J H (*Dumfriesshire*)
Mitchell, William
Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (*Shropshire*)
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (*Bute*
Myers, William Henry
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Joseph (*Louth, S.*)
O'Connor, Jas. (*Wicklow, W.*)
Pease, H. Pike (*Darlington*)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (*Greenock*)
Remnant, Jas. Farquharson
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson
Roberts, John Bryn (*Eifion*)
Robertson, H. (*Hackney*)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James

Rutherford, W. W. (*Liverpool*)
Sadler, Col. Saml. Alexander
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (*Renfrew*)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H C (*North'mb, Tyneside*
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (*Strand*)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (*Chichester*)
Thomson, F. W. (*York, W. R.*)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. E. M.
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Walton, Joseph (*Barnsley*)
Webb, Col. William George
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (*Notts*)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (*Falkirk*)
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (*Yorks.*)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn E. R. (*Bath*)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Ayes—
Mr. David Morgan and
Mr. Forde Ridley.

NOES.

Abraham, William (*Rhondda*)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Broadhurst, Henry
Burt, Thomas
Campbell, John (*Armagh, S.*)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cecil, Lord Hugh (*Greenwich*)
Channing, Francis Allston
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Craig, Robert Hunter (*Lanark*)
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Ed.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*

Galloway, William Johnson
Gretton, John
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Horner, Frederick William
Jones, Wm. (*Carnarvonshire*)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Leng, Sir John
Lundon, W.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Killop, W. (*Sligo, North*)
Markham, Arthur Basil
O'Brien, P. J. *Tipperary, N.*)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (*Mayo, N.*)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Pirie, Duncan V.

Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Richards, Henry Charles
Samuel, Herbt. L. (*Cleveland*)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (*Hawick, B.*)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (*Forfarshire*)
Thomas, David A. (*Merthyr*)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Valentia, Viscount
White, George (*Norfolk*)
Whitley, J. H. (*Halifax*)
Wilson, A. S. (*York, E. R.*)
Wilson, John (*Durham, Mid*)

Tellers for the Noes—
Mr. Vicary Gibbs and
Mr. John Burns.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

CHARING CROSS, EUSTON AND HAMPSTEAD RAILWAY BILL.

Mr. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tonbridge) said he begged leave to move the Instruction standing in his name with regard to the Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill. The words in Clause 8 which he proposed to omit related to the taking away of the subsoil without compensation. He noticed that according to this Bill the full price was paid in this respect to the owner of the adjoining property, and his contention was that this was a new principle which was now being introduced, and was one which ought not to be agreed to by this House. His object was to make a provision whereby the owner of the subsoil might protect his property from damage by means of compensation, whereas if the company was allowed to take the subsoil without this provision, it appeared to him that such owners would not be protected. In the Bills passed last year —he alluded to the Tube Bills—a provision of this kind was inserted, and a similar provision was inserted in the City and North-East Suburban Electric Railway Bill, the Second Reading of which had just been passed. This provision secured that in the case of owners whose property was not taken if damage was done by the work compensation would be paid. If this Instruction was not agreed to, a man might have the subsoil taken from him, and in the event of his property being damaged he would not be in a position to obtain any compensation whatever from the company. He did not think he needed to labour the matter any further, because he had been given to understand that the promoters were willing to meet him by accepting his Instruction. The effect of this Instruction would be to allow the Company to take the subsoil, but not to allow them to take it without paying for it in the usual way. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee to omit, in Clause 8, page 7, all the words before the words 'the Company,' in line 32, and all the words after the word 'respectively,' in line 36."—(*Mr. Griffith Boscawen.*

MR. SKEWES-COX (Surrey, Kingston) said he rose to say that on behalf of the promoters of this Bill they have no objection to the Instruction of the hon. Member for Tonbridge, which they were willing to accept.

MR. VICARY GIBBS (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) said that all he desired to say was that he hoped the action which had been taken by this company in regard to this matter would be followed by any other companies coming up before this House for Bills of a similar character, for if this were done much needless discussion would be avoided.

Question put, and agreed to.

THE CITY AND SOUTH LONDON RAILWAY BILL.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said the Instruction he wished to move now was a similar Instruction to that which the House had carried on the previous Bill, and he moved it for exactly the same purpose. He hoped, therefore, that the promoters would agree to accept it. If that course were not taken, he should be obliged to divide the House upon this Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee to omit, in Clause 4, the words "without being required to purchase the same or any easement therein or thereunder.'"—(*Mr. Griffith Boscawen.*)

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.) said he did not think that these two Bills were exactly on all fours, and even if they were, personally he thought the time had come when the House of Commons should not allow its own business to be conducted by a sort of outside negotiation between those who opposed a Bill and the so-called promoters of a Bill. Personally he wished to say that he had absolutely no interest and very little knowledge of the points dealt with in either the Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill, or the City and South London Railway Bill, but he was informed with regard to this Instruction that this was a question upon which the promoters had not absolutely come to terms with those advocating it, and they contended that it differed from the Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill, inasmuch as this was a new Bill upon which the sub-soil was not affected in the same way. He wished to say that he had not any desire to pronounce upon the arguments of his hon. friend the Member for Tonbridge, either for or against. All he wished was that the House of Commons, might not allow matters which properly belonged to the House of Commons, or the Committee upstairs, to be settled by those who were for or against in the Lobby. Let this matter, which was essentially one to be determined after examining the representatives for and against, be settled by a Committee upstairs absolutely uninfluenced by any sordid motive. [AN HON. MEMBER: Are we so influenced?] He had not suggested that, and he did not know why his hon. friends seemed to be so concerned about it. The Committee examined this question and decided it upon its merits, and therefore he hoped the House would not adopt this Instruction.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said his hon. friend suggested that there had been some sort of negotiation in this matter. Might he be allowed to say that there had been no negotiation whatever, and he had not been in any sort of communication with those interested in this Bill. He wished to point out that the two clauses to which he had alluded were absolutely identical in effect in both cases, and inasmuch as the House had agreed to one principle the same applied to the other.

MR. JOHN BURNS said he thought the hon. Member for Islington's conscience would prick him before the evening was out. He now saw the evil of supporting the previous Bill, for it had carried him further than he really thought it would do. If this matter of the sub-soil had been referred to the Royal Commission they would not have had the hon. Member's speech, and public owners in regard to the sub-soil would have been properly protected. The proper course was that which the hon. Member for Islington tardily admitted, that was, for the House not to recognise the promoters' concession to some gentlemen who represented from an absolutely disinterested point of view a certain principle with regard to the acquisition of private property. The hon. Member was perfectly entitled to put before the Committee this principle, but he thought it was a matter which ought not to be advanced in the way of Instruction upon a Bill like this. The House saw now the error of its ways, and desired to find a way out. The way out of the difficulty was to withdraw the Instruction from the previous Bill and let both Bills unconditionally go either to the Committee upstairs or to the Royal Commission, and have evidence produced of damage done either to private or public properties and let the Committee or the Royal Commission determine the principle and the amount of compensation. But the House had thought fit, against its better judgment, to resolve upon a less excellent course. He was sorry that he was not able to convert the House to the better view. If private property was damaged, and public rights were encroached upon, as they would be if these instructions were carried, the House of Commons must not blame the hon. Member for Battersea, but they must blame those gentlemen who, at the behest of a few politicians, had undermined the rights of property.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 57; Noes, 162. (Division List, No. 29.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (*Hornsey*
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bignold, Arthur
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (*Greenwich*)
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrano, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colston, Chas. Edw H. Athole
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Ed.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Fisher, William Hayes
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Graham, Henry Robert
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hardy, Laurence (*Kent, Ashfd*
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Howard, J. (*Midd., Tott'ham*
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Lawson, John Grant
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
M'Arthur, Charles (*Liverpool*)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Myers, William Henry
Pease, H. Pike (*Darlington*)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pym, C. Guy
Ridley, Hon. M. W (*Stalybridge*
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (*Renfrew*)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Stock, James Henry
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (*Chichester*)
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (*Yorks.*)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Griffith Boscawen and
Mr. Vicary Gibbs.

NOES.

Abraham, William (*Rhondda*)
Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)
Allen, Chas. P. (*Glos., Stroud*)
Allhusen, Aug. Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther, H. T.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (*Leeds*
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V C W (*Derbysh.*)
Channing, Francis Allston
Collings, Right Hon. Jesse
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasgow*)
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Craig, Robert Hunter (*Lanark*)
Cranborne, Viscount
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Cross, H. Shepherd (*Bolton*)
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (*Carmarthen*)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (*Cardign*
Delany, William
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Douglas, Charles M. (*Lanark*)
Duffy, William J.
Duke, Henry Edward
Duncan, J. Hastings
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (*Leith*
Ffrench, Peter
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hardie, J. Keir (*Merthyr Tyd*
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helder, Augustus
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Horner, Frederick William
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Wm. (*Carnarvonshire*)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Kitson, Sir James
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (*Gbasgow*)
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (*Monm'th*)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (*Accrington*)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lockie, John
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (*Evesham*
Lucas, Reginald J. (*Portsmouth*
Lundon, W.
Maconochie, A. W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Maxwell, W. J. H. (*Dumfriessh.*
Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (*Hants.*
More, Robt. Jasper (*Shropshire*)
Morgan, D. J. (*Walthamstow*)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (*Carmarthen*
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robt. Gray C.
Murphy, John
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (*Bute*
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Joseph (*Louth, S.*)
O'Brien, K. (*Tipperary, Mid*)
O'Brien, Patrick (*Kilkenny*)
O'Brien, P. J. *Tipperary, N.*)
O'Dowd, John
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Pirie, Duncan V.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Power, Patrick Joseph
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Rea, Russell
Redmond, William (*Clare*)
Reid, James (*Greenock*)
Remnant, Jas. Farquharson
Ridley, S. F. (*Bethnal Green*)
Roberts, Samuel (*Sheffield*)
Robertson, H. (*Hackney*)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (*Liverpool*)
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Samuel, Herbt. L. (*Cleveland*)
Samuel, S. M. (*Whitechapel*)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (*Marylebone, W.*)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (*Isle of Wight*
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (*Hawick, B.*)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smith, H. C (*North'mb. Tyneside*
Smith, Jas. Parker (*Lanarks.*)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (*Northants*
Stevenson, Francis S.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, David A. (*Merthyr*)
Thomson, F. W. (*York, W. R.*)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomkinson, James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. E. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Walton, Joseph (*Barnsley*)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Webb, Col. William George
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (*Notts*)
White, George (*Norfolk*)
Whiteley, G. (*York, W. R.*)
Whitley, J. H. (*Halifax*)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. S. (*York, E. R.*)
Wilson, John (*Durham, Mid*)
Wilson, John (*Falkirk*)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (*Bath*
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Cohen and Colonel Lucas.

SUPPLY.

[1ST ALLOTTED DAY.]

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £1,638,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Retired Pay, Half-Pay, and other Non-Effective Charges for Officers, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1904."

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said it was a little difficult to discuss this important Vote, as they all understood that this

Vote was not going to be taken to-day. The Prime Minister had distinctly announced that the previous Vote would be allowed to be discussed during the whole of to-day's proceedings because he said it would be necessary to get the Vote by twelve o'clock. They were now asked to pass a Vote of £1,638,000 without having had a reasonable opportunity of examining it. There were one or two things he wished to ask the Government. They had heard from the representatives of the War Office that they had been making a considerable extension in the employment of soldiers on half-pay and on retired pay, and he noticed an increasing number of cases in the Estimates where such employment was found. He should like to ask the Government what arrangements they made in a case of that kind. Was the salary entirely in addition to retired pay or half-pay, or was the retired pay or half-pay taken into account in the new payment that was made for the services rendered? On the second page of this Vote there was the sum of £10,000 as rewards to officers for distinguished or meritorious services. He should like to have some information as to the methods on which this amount was allotted. He was rather surprised to find that practically every man received the same amount according to his rank. For his part he could not see that there was much judgment in allotting this money for meritorious service if they gave exactly the same amount to all officers of the same rank. He would have thought that that £10,000, which was intended by the House to be put at the disposal of the War Office as a special reward for special services, would have been allotted with much more discrimination than appeared to be exercised. Was it likely, for instance, that all the lieutenant-generals did meritorious service exactly equal in value? He could not understand any business being conducted in that way. The money ought to be awarded in amounts proportionate to the service rendered, and surely there was a very wide difference between the services rendered to their country by these various officers. He wished to know further if these rewards were permanent. He noticed that they were voted by the House year by year, and he would like to be told if, when once an award was made to an officer, it was a permanent award or merely an annual or temporary grant. He noticed at the bottom of one page a note on the question of retired pay, stating that in some cases the amount actually drawn exceeded the rate by Royal Warrant, owing to compensation being given for loss of prospects to officers compulsorily retired. If an officer were compulsorily retired he presumed it was because they were not satisfied with his services, and if the authorities were compelled to take such a step, it ought not to be necessary to compensate the officer for loss of prospects. That was a matter which required consideration.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER pointed out that, in spite of the large demobilisation at the end of the war, there were now more officers on active employment and fewer on half-pay than there were a year ago. He would like to know whether there had been such an enormous flow of promotion that the higher ranks were over-filled, and it seemed to him that the result of the mobilisation would be to increase rather than decrease the number of officers on half-pay.

MR. PIRIE complained of the Vote being taken that evening. He had desired to call attention to what he considered to be abuses in the non-effective Vote. He had on the Paper a Question asking for a Return of the sums expended during the last five years on the non-effective Vote. It was only fair that the House should have that statement before it was asked to pass the Vote. He wished to have an explanation how it was there were ninety-two lieutenant-colonels and colonels placed on half-pay in 1903–4 as compared with sixty-six in 1902–3. In the same years there was an increase of four majors and of five captains. Seeing that this country was the only one which kept a half-pay list as a means of punishment he thought he was entitled to ask for that explanation.

*MR. BRODRICK replied that obviously after a campaign in which a very large number of additional officers had been engaged, there was not now employment for all of them, and consequently some of them had been placed on the half-pay list, possibly only for a time. So far as the general officers' list was concerned, the principle of selection which was now fully in force would ultimately greatly lessen the number of general officers on half-pay. In explanation of the foot-note referred to by the hon. Member for Halifax, it referred to cases in which officers were compulsorily retired under the old Royal Warrant on larger sums than were now allowed. No such cases occurred in the present day, however. He had long felt that the principle on which distinguished service awards was given was not defensible. He was glad the hon. Member had called attention to this matter, because undoubtedly a good case had been made out for a change. Under the present system an officer receiving £2,000 a year might get the award, but when he was retired on perhaps £800, he was deprived of the £100 a year distinguished service award at the very moment he most needed it. With the full concurrence of the Commander-in-Chief he had laid it down that a man who had been selected for a reward for distinguished service should not get the money while he was in receipt of full pay, but when he finally went on half-pay, when he probably needed it most. In regard to the general position of the Vote, the Committee would be glad to note that there was a considerable reduction.

*SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) joined heartily in the protests against this Vote for one and a half millions being brought on that evening. It was contrary to the distinct understanding arrived at.

Mr. Brodrick.

*MR. BRODRICK: On what do you base that?

*SIR WALTER FOSTER said he based it on the statement of the Prime Minister that the Government would be satisfied if they got Vote A and Vote I on Thursday night. They had got those Votes at the afternoon sitting, by means of the Closure, the use of which was no part of the bargain. It was not treating them with consideration to have other Votes like this one brought on and pushed through Committee late in the evening. The Government had had an exceedingly good time in the last few days. They had had, moreover, the satisfaction at last of seeing their critical friends below the Gangway support them—a change of front due no doubt to a recent remarkable election. This all the more justified the protest. In any case a Vote of this kind wanted to be looked into with the closest scrutiny, and there was no opportunity of doing that in consequence of the action of the Government in bringing it on unexpectedly and contrary to what was understood by Members on the Opposition side.

*MR. BRODRICK thought the indignation of the hon. Gentleman was a little thin. Those who had watched the discussions during the last four days must admit, he thought, that his right hon. friend the Prime Minister had given most ample opportunity to those who wished to criticise the Government on Vote A and Vote I. He carefully watched the debate that afternoon, and he noted that until about a quarter of an hour before the adjournment there was no sign of any wish to raise further discussion on Vote I.

It had always been the custom when the House had obviously exhausted its criticism, not to allow one or two individuals to stand in the way of getting on with the business. In addition to that the non-effective had never been the subject of prolonged discussion; they were the same year by year; no fresh principle was introduced on this occasion, and he really thought they might be allowed to continue, without protest, the modest amount of business which remained to be got through.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs) pointed out that the very modest amount of business to which the right hon. Gentleman referred consisted of voting £3,500,000 more than anything that the Prime Minister spoke of getting that night. The right hon. Gentleman the other day said that for reasons which could be chronologically justified, it was necessary, in his opinion, to get Vote A and Vote I by that evening, and on that occasion he ventured to put in a little *caveat* and intimated that he must not be held to consent to that course if it involved an undue curtailment of debate. When the debate was gradually dying down in the usual pleasant way, the Prime Minister thought it not inconvenient or disrespectful to the House to move the Closure, just at the moment the House had no expectation of its being done, and when many Members who possibly had something to say on the Vote had gone away. Now the right hon. Gentleman proposed to take Votes for another £3,500,000 in order to make the Government perfectly independent of the House of Commons, as far as the Army Estimates were concerned, until July next. That certainly was not dealing fairly with the House. He maintained that, from the point of view of the Government, it was a grave breach of the understanding which existed, to move the Closure at the time when it was moved. The Government, therefore, ought not to persist in taking any more Votes that night, the opportunity for which had been gained in such a way.

Mr. BROADHURST (Leicester) said the Secretary of State for War had made very light of that matter. He had stated that from time immemorial it had been the practice to pass these non-effective items without debate. That time, however, had now passed; Members wanted to know more about these matters. The non-effective part of the British Army had become so very considerable that they felt bound, in the interest of the nation and of the safety of the Empire, to go into that part of the subject at greater length than they had done in the past. There were 284 non-effective colonels at £500 a year each. That was a serious matter, and required looking into. Then with regard to rewards and allowances for meritorious and distinguished services, there were several columns filled with grants of £10. Surely some explanation should be given of how all these distinguished services came to be worth exactly £10 apiece. He moved to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Broadhurst.*)

*Mr. BRODRICK thought the Motion could hardly have been made with any expectation that the Government would accept it. He hoped the Committee would continue business.

MR. PIRIE said he had put a Question on the Paper with direct reference to this particular Vote, asking for a Return of the increase therein for the last five years, expecting to get the Return early next week, when he had presumed the Vote would be discussed. He therefore supported the Motion.

MR. LOUGH said it was impossible to discuss the Vote to-night. Relying on the pledge of the Prime Minister Members had prepared themselves only for Vote I.

*MR. BRODRICK said that no pledge whatever had been given. The Prime Minister stated that he wanted Vote A and Vote I before the end of the evening, but he did not pledge himself not to proceed further.

MR. LOUGH contended that there was a distinct understanding that only those two Votes would be taken, and on that understanding many Members had left the House. It was now sought to get another two or three millions of money voted. The Government were trying to hustle things through in the meanest possible way, and he thought there was no more reasonable proposition than that they should report Progress.

LORD ALWYNE COMPTON (Bedfordshire, Biggleswade) agreed that the Vote was a most important one, and he was burning to discuss it. He, however, was quite prepared to make his criticisms at once, and he protested against business being interrupted by such a Motion as that before the Committee.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN asked the Secretary of State whether he had ever known a case when the non-effectives had been taken on the same night as Vote I.

*MR. BRODRICK said he had known much more important Votes taken on the same night as Vote I. He looked upon it as a proof of the moderation of the Prime Minister that he had put down only the non-effective Votes. He was not certain, but he believed that even in the life of the present Parliament the non-effective Votes, or some of them, had been taken the same night as Vote I.

MR. WHITLEY put forward as an additional reason for reporting Progress the fact that they had heard that night for the first time that this sum of £10,000 a year for meritorious services was to be dealt with on a new plan. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that in future these rewards would come into force only on the retirement of the officers concerned, and that was entirely inconsistent with the Vote as submitted.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) suggested that it would be reasonable if the Opposition would allow this particular Vote to be taken on the understanding that no other non-effective Vote should be taken that night.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said the suggestion of the noble Lord would hardly be acceptable, because many Members had gone, being under the impression that the non-effective Votes would not be taken.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 64; Noes, 154. (Division List No. 30.)

AYES.

Allen, Chas. P. (*Glos., Stroud*)
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbt. Hy.
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter(*Lanark*)
Davies, Alfred (*Carmarthen*)
Delany, William
Douglas, Charles M. (*Lanark*)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (*Leith*
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-Helme, Norval Watson
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Wm. (*Carnarvonshire*)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (*Accrington*)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (*Carmarthen*)
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
O'Brien, P. J. *Tipperary, N.*)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Roberts, John Bryn (*Eifion*)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbt. L. (*Cleveland*)
Samuel, S. M. (*Whitechapel*)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (*Hawick, B.*)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (*Forfarshire*)
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(*Northants*
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, David A. (*Merthyr*)
Thomas,J.A(*Gl'm'rgan,Gower*
Tomkinson, James
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Wason, J. Cathcart (*Orkney*)
White, George (*Norfolk*)
Whitley, J. H. (*Halifax*)
Wilson, John (*Durham, Mid*)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Causton.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Aug. Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn.SirH.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (*Man'r*
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (*Hornsey*
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (*Leeds*
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V C W (*Derbysh.*)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (*Greenwich*)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J A (*Worc*
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Collings, Right Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Cox, Irwin Edwd. Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, H. Shepherd (*Bolton*)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Jos. C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Ed.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (*St. Albans*
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(*Elgin & Nrn*
Graham, Henry Robert
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Hardie, J. Keir (*Merthyr Tyd*
Hardy, Laurence (*Kent,Ashfd*
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(*Salop*
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (*Glasgow*
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (*Monm'th*)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (*Bristol, S.*
Lucas, Col. Francis (*Lowestoft*
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Killop, Jas. (*Stirlingshire*)
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E(*Wigt'n*
Maxwell,W.J.H.(*Dumfriessh.*
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
More,Robt. Jasper(*Shropshire*
Morgan, D. J. (*Walthamstow*)
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(*Bute*
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Palmer, Walter (*Salisbury*)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert

Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (*Greenock*)
Remnant, Jas. Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (*Stalybridge*
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (*Sheffield*)
Robertson, H. (*Hackney*)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (*Liverpool*)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Saml. Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (*Marylebone, W.*)
Seely, Maj-J. E. B. (*Isle of Wight*
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (*Renfrew*
Smith, H C (*North'mb. Tyneside*
Smith, Jas. Parker (*Lanarks.*)
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (*Strand*)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir Jn. M.
Stock, James Henry
Sturt, Hn. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (*Chichester*)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. E. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C. E H (*Sheffield*
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Webb, Col. William George
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (*Notts*)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (*York; E. R*
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (*Bath*
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said he wished to know why, after the demobilisation of the Army in South Africa which had necessarily put several generals on half-pay, they now had fewer generals on half-pay than they had last year, when a number of men who ought to have been on half-pay were employed in the field. In order to obtain a reply he would move the reduction of the Vote by £100.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON, (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) on a point of order, asked if moving a reduction on Item B would prejudice his right to move a reduction on Item A.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not a point of order; it depends on whether the hon. Gentleman wishes to give way.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said he was quite willing to withdraw his Motion in order to allow his hon. friend to proceed.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON said that when he asked a question about the allocation of the £10,000 for rewards for meritorious services, the Secretary of State informed the Committee that he had a new scheme for the allocation of the money. Those new schemes were getting a little bewildering, and perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would excuse him asking him one or two questions with reference to his latest scheme. He understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that in future the money voted by Parliament for this purpose would not be received by the officers concerned until they had retired on half-pay. If that was so the Vote now presented to the Committee was incorrect, because it included officers on the active list as well as officers on the retired list. That was the reason why they should have the right hon. Gentleman's scheme in black and white before they proceeded to discuss the Vote, and in order that that might be done he would move the reduction of Item A by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Rewards to Officers for Distinguished Services) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Alfred Hutton.*)

*MR. BRODRICK said the question was a very simple one. Officers holding appointments would not draw rewards, but when they were on half-pay or retired pay they would draw them.

MR. HUTTON said that many of the officers concerned were not on retired pay.

*MR. BRODRICK said that the scheme would only apply to grants made in the future.

MR. HUTTON said that after the right hon. Gentleman's explanation he would withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. PIRIE said he wished to move a reduction of the Vote in consequence of the insufficient reply which had been given with regard to the details of Item C. He referred to the increase of the item for half-pay for colonels and lieutenant-colonels. The Secretary of State for War explained the increase by saying that it was due to the conclusion of the South African War. He should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether in appointing fresh officers to any appointments which might be created under the new Army Corps system, regard would be paid to economy as well as to fitness for selection. A certain sum would be saved by giving billets to officers on half-pay; and he wished to know whether the War Office intended to study economy in making such appointments. He also wished to know whether every officer would have to submit to a strict medical examination before taking up a Staff appointment. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item C (Half-Pay of Regimental and Departmental Officers eligible for Employment) be reduced by £7,680."—(*Mr Pirie.*)

*MR. BRODRICK said that the close of the war had left a number of colonels and other officers of lower rank whose services were not required immediately, and they had gone temporarily on half-pay. Other things being equal, economy would always be studied, and, if officers were eligible for appointment, they would be employed.

MR. LOUGH said the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman was a general one. He thought his hon. friend was right, and that the right hon. Gentleman was unable to explain the increase. The only explanation they got was that it was because of the war in South Africa, and that did not appear to him to be sufficient.

MR. PIRIE asked if the right hon. Gentleman would be prepared to grant a return giving the names of the officers.

Question put

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 64; Noes, 153. (Division List, No. 31.)

AYES

Allen, Chas. P. (*Glos., Stroud*)
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbt. Hy.
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter (*Lanark*
Davies, Alfred (*Carmarthen*)
Delany, William
Douglas, Charles M. (*Lanark*)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (*Leith*
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hardie, J. Keir (*Merthyr Tyd*
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Wm. (*Carnarvonshire*)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (*Accrington*)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (*Carmarthen*
Murphy, John
O'Brien, P. J. (*Tipperary, N.*)
Roberts, John Bryn (*Eifion*)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbert L. (*Cleveland*)
Samuel, S. M. (*Whitechapel*)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (*Hawick, B.*)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (*Forfarshire*)
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (*Northants*
Stevenson, Francis S.
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, David Alfred (*Merthyr*
Thomas, J. A. (*Glam., Gower*)
Tomkinson, James
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart (*Orkney*)
White, George (*Norfolk*)
Whitley, J. H. (*Halifax*)
Wilson, John (*Durham, Mid*)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Pirie and Mr. Lough.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Aug. Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (*Man'r*
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (*Hornsey*
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (*Leeds*
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V C W (*Derbysh.*)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J A (*Worc*
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Cox, Irwin Edwd. Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, H. Shepherd (*Bolton*)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Jos. C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Ed.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (*St. Albans*
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Graham, Henry Robert
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Hardy, Laurence (*Kent, Ashfd*
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (*Salop*
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (*Glasgow*
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (*Monm'th*)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (*Bristol, S.*
Lowther, C. (*Cumb. Eskdale*)
Lucas, Col. Francis (*Lowestoft*
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (*Liverpool*)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Killop, Jas. (*Stirlingshire*)
Maxwell, Rt Hn. Sir H E (*Wigt'n*
Maxwell, W. J. H. (*Dumfriessh.*
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
More, Robt. Jasper (*Shropshire*
Morgan, David J (*Walthamst'w*
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (*Bute*
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Palmer, Walter (*Salisbury*)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (*Greenock*)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (*Stalybridge*
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (*Sheffield*)
Robertson, Herbert (*Hackney*)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (*Liverpool*
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Saml. Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Scott, Sir S. (*Marylebone, W.*
Seely, Charles Hilton (*Lincoln*
Seely, Mj. J. E. B. (*Isle of Wight*
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (*Renfrew*
Smith, H C (*North'mb. Tyneside*
Smith, James Parker (*Lanarks*

Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (*Strand*)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (*Chichester*)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Ed. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward

Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,ColSirC. E. H(*Sheffield*
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Webb, Col. William George
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (*Notts*)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. S. (*York, E. R.*)
Wodehouse,Rt. Hn. E. R. (*Bath*

Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, MajorW. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Original Question again proposed.

And it being after Midnight, the Chairman proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Whereupon MR. SECRETARY BRODRICK rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 155; Noes, 64. (Division List, No. 32.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Aug. Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (*Man'r*
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (*Hornsey*
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (*Leeds*
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish,V. C. W. (*Derbyshire*
Chamberlain,Rt. HnJ. A(*Worc*
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Cox, Irwin Edwd. Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, H. Shepherd (*Bolton*)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Jos. C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Ed.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (*St. Albans*
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon,Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Graham, Henry Robert
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Hardy, Laurence (*Kent, Ashfd*
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (*Salop*
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (*Glasgow*)
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (*Monm'th*)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (*Bristol, S.*
Lowther, C. (*Cumb. Eskdale*)
Lucas, Col. Francis (*Lowestoft*
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Lundon, W.
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (*Liverpool*)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Killop, James (*Stirlingshire*
Maxwell,RtHnSirH. E(*Wigt'n*
Maxwell,WJ,H(*Dumfriesshire*

Melville, Beresford Valentine
Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
More, Robt. Jasper (*Shropshire*
Morgan,DavidJ. (*Walth'mstow*
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA. Graham(*Bute*
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Brien, P. J. (*Tipperary, N.*)
Palmer, Walter (*Salisbury*)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pilkington,Lieut-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (*Greenock*)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (*Stalybridge*
Ritchie,Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (*Sheffield*)
Robertson, H. (*Hackney*)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (*Liverpool*)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Scott, Sir S. (*Marylebone, W.*
Seely, Charles Hilton (*Lincoln*
Seely,Maj. J. E. B(*Isle of Wight*
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (*Renfrew*)
Smith,H. C. (*North'mb, Tyneside*
Smith,James Parker (*Lanarks*
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (*Strand*
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry

Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (*Chichester*)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,ColSirC.E.H(*Sheffield*
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,RtHnSir William H.
Webb, Col. William George
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (*Notts*)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A.Stanley (*York,E. R.*
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (*Bath*
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Chas. P. (*Glos., Stroud*)
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbt Hy.
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter (*Lanark*
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (*Carmarthen*)
Douglas, Charles M. (*Lanark*)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (*Leith*
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hardie, J. Keir (*Merthyr Tyd*
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Wm. (*Carnarvonshire*)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (*Accrington*)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lough, Thomas
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (*Carmarthen*)
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Pirie, Duncan V.
Roberts, John Bryn (*Eifion*)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbert L. (*Cleveland*
Samuel, S. M. (*Whitechapel*)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (*Hawick, B.*)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (*Forfarshire*)
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (*Northants*
Stevenson, Francis S.
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, David A. (*Merthyr*)
Thomas, J. A. (*Glam., Gower*)
Tomkinson, James
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart (*Orkney*
White, George (*Norfolk*)
Whitley, J. H. (*Halifax*)
Wilson, John (*Durham, Mid.*)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Causton.

Original Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

Mr. GALLOWAY asked when the Government proposed to take the Report Stage of Vote A and Vote I of the Army Estimates.

Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD (Somersetshire, W.) said the intention of the Government was to move the Speaker out of the Chair on Monday on the Navy Estimates. The Report Stage of the Army Estimates would not be taken before Wednesday.

NEW BILLS.

POOR PRISONERS' DEFENCE.

Bill to make provision for the Defence of Poor Prisoners, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bousfield, Mr. Cripps, Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. Perks, Mr. Kimber, Mr. Butcher, Mr. Atherley-Jones, Mr. Marshall Hall, and Mr. Duke.

FALSE CHARACTERS.

Bill for the prevention of giving False Characters to servants, and of offences connected therewith, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bousfield and Mr. Herbert Robertson.

POOR PRISONERS' DEFENCE BILL.

"To make provision for the Defence of Poor Prisoners," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 102.]

FALSE CHARACTERS BILL.

"For the better prevention of giving False Characters to servants and of offences connected therewith," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 26th March, and to be printed. [Bill 103.]

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 13*th March*, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :

Electric Lighting (London) [H.L.]; the same was ordered to lie on the Table.

North-Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill [H.L.]; a petition of Messrs. Baker, Lees, and Company, of 54, Parliament Street, Westminster, parliamentary agents, praying for leave to present a petition of the Promoters of the Shropshire and Worcestershire and East Denbighshire Electric Power Bill, praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill, although the time limited by Standing Order No. 92, for presenting such petition, has expired; read, and ordered to lie on the Table; and Standing Order No. 92 to be considered on Monday next in order to its being dispensed with in respect of the said petition.

Maryport Harbour Bill [H.L.]; read 2ª (according to order).

Life Association of Scotland Bill [H.L.]; Milford Docks Bill [H.L.]; Indiarubber, Guttapercha, and Telegraph Works Company Bill [H.L.]; Lima Railways Bill [H.L.]; committed.

Sheffield and South Yorkshire Navigation Bill [H.L.]; committed: the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY.

Evidence of Lieutenant-Colonel D. A. Kinloch, C.B., M.V.O., before the Court of Inquiry held by the order of the General Officer Commanding the Home District, on 14th December, 1902.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Code of Regulations for day schools, 1903.

MINES AND QUARRIES (GENERAL REPORT AND STATISTICS FOR 1901. PART IV. COLONIAL AND FOREIGN STATISTICS).

Statistics relating to persons employed, out-put, and accidents at mines and quarries in the British Colonies and in foreign countries.

Presented [by Command] and ordered to lie on the Table.

AFFAIRS IN MACEDONIA.

LORD NEWTON: My Lords, in rising to call attention to the correspondence recently presented to Parliament respecting the affairs of South-Eastern Europe, I cannot help feeling some slight surprise that this duty has not been undertaken by someone in a more responsible position than myself, and I presume that the explanation of this abstention is due to the altered view with which we regard affairs in European Turkey at the present moment, and also to the recognition—the tardy recognition—of the fact that we now realise that the execution of the Treaty of Berlin does not depend upon this country only. The contents of the Blue-book in question have a painful resemblance to many publications of a similar nature with regard to Turkey, with which we are all familiar, but there is this difference, that, whereas in recent years our attention has been called to cases which have arisen from the oppression of one particular race by the Turkish Government, in the present instance the question is complicated by the presence of various nationalities in the provinces which are somewhat vaguely and comprehensively known as Macedonia. There are various races—there is the governing race, the Turks themselves; there are the Bulgarians, the Servians, the Greeks, and finally the semi-barbarous and fanatical Albanians, over whom the Porte appears unable to exercise much control; and I might add that the question is rendered more difficult by the fact that these races entertain for each other a detestation almost as great as that with which they regard the ruling power.

The three Christian nationalities—the Bulgarians, the Servians, and the Greeks—have, ever since the Treaty of Berlin, looked upon what is known as Macedonia as their natural heritage when the Turkish Empire is finally, if ever, broken up, and with this view each of these races has maintained a political propaganda of its own. In this competition, however, two of the competitors have of recent years weakened considerably. The Servians have ceased to be serious competitors; the competition of the Greeks has been greatly enfeebled in consequence of the war which they so foolishly provoked a few years ago, and the field is now really in possession of the more numerous, more powerful, and, I might add, more unscrupulous race—viz., the Bulgarians. Trouble in the spring in Macedonia has been prophesied for many years—trouble being a euphemistic expression for outrage, murder, and atrocities. The formula has usually run in this way: "When the snows melt in Macedonia there will be trouble in that country," and I do not think that anyone who is unacquainted with the Balkan Provinces realises how importantly climatic conditions affect the safety of life and property there. I remember years ago a Bulgarian statesman informing me that with the first indication of spring, when the leaves began to appear, he used to lay hands on everybody who showed signs of vice, and despatch them to remote parts of the country, and that when the leaves disappeared these men were let out again. In consequence, people who travelled in the autumn months did so, in the view of the Bulgarian Government, at their own risk, "because," he said, "when the trees are bare people can see what is going on; they can see brigands and robbers approaching, and are not entitled to any special protection from the Government, but must look after themselves."

Rumours of disorders occurring in the spring in Macedonia have every year increased in intensity. The present Blue-book goes back to the last days of December, 1900, and opens with the despatch which I think is a clue to the whole question. I do not stand here as an apologist for Turkish rule. I have seen something of it; enough, at all events, to realise that it is a most undesirable Government, and that no progressive race can be expected to live contentedly under it. But, at the same time, I think that any impartial person who has read this Blue-book must have come to the conclusion that the responsibility for the present lamentable state of things in Macedonia is not solely that of the Turkish Government. For my own part, I have no hesitation in saying that the greater part of the responsibility for the events which are now occurring in Macedonia is due to the action of the Bulgarian Revolutionary Committees. First of all, I should like to explain that the object of these committees is not the amelioration of the condition of the inhabitants of the country, but to bring about a state of things which will result in the interference of European Powers, and eventually in these Provinces becoming either autonomous or being taken possession of by other countries; the methods by which this propaganda is carried on are so detestable, in my opinion, that it is almost impossible to speak of them with moderation.

The methods of these revolutionary committees are, shortly speaking, brigandage, blackmail, extortion, robbery, and murder. Now, if these crimes were perpetrated solely at the expense of the Turkish Government or the Mussulman inhabitants there would be some palliation for their commission, but they are committed equally upon Christians; blackmailing and extortion, and even murder, are not confined to Turkish territory, but are carried on in other countries, although it is true that up to the present moment the revolutionary committees have not had the audacity to murder the subjects of any of the great Powers, for the purpose of extorting money from them. In Macedonia itself these committees work in armed bands, which are organised in Bulgaria, which retreat to Bulgaria when they are too severely pressed, and which, as long as they are unmolested, perpetrate every conceivable outrage. As I have said, the deliberate object of these proceedings is to get the Turkish Government to commit a massacre on a large scale, involving the murder of numbers of perfectly innocent people, with the view of bringing about European intervention, and, in my opinion, these callous proceedings are as repulsive as the blind and brutal ferocity of the semi-barbarous Turks themselves.

This is a thing which has been going on for years, though, I admit, not on the present scale, and the scandalous part of the business is that the Bulgarian Government have really never taken any effective steps to stop the proceedings of the revolutionary committees. There really has been very little mystery about these proceedings. Some years ago I was in the Bulgarian capital, and I remember that at that period bands used to be formed, almost as picnic or sporting parties are formed in more civilised parts of the world, to embark on filibustering expeditions in Macedonia. They used to go out to kill as many Turks as they could conveniently despatch, and retire when the time came to Bulgaria, and, so little concealment was there about it, that I remember one of these bands being deliberately photographed before they started, and if the noble Marquess would like to see it I could show him a copy of the photograph. This thing has been going on for years. It is perfectly true that the Bulgarian Government occasionally takes the opportunity of dissociating itself from and repudiating the action of these committees, but the fact remains that the committees are organised in Bulgaria; that their headquarters are in the capital of that country; that their incendiary literature is published there; that their public meetings are held there; that they are frequently led by retired officers in the Bulgarian Army; that they are armed with Government rifles; and that in some instances they wear Bulgarian uniforms. Occasionally the Bulgarian Government is driven by remonstrances from outside to take action, but somehow or other the ringleaders when arrested invariably escape. Under these circumstances I think, without being a pro-Turk, I am justified in saying that the Turkish Government has been subjected to almost intolerable provocation.

On this particular point I do not base my statement on the complaints of the Turkish Government—I know, by experience, that whether the Turkish Government speaks the truth or not, not the slightest attention is likely to be paid to their complaint—but on independent testimony which will be found in the Blue-book. The Blue-book opens in the last days of the year 1900 with a complaint from the Greek Government with regard to the procedure of these bands; and in January, 1901, the French Ambassador made a similar complaint to the noble Marquess. In the following month the Sultan was urged by the Russian Ambassador at Constantinople to take measures to suppress the Bulgarian committees. In the same month Count Lamsdorff complained that the Committees had degenerated into anarchical propaganda whose chief aim was to extort money by intimidation; and later on the Russian Ambassador at Constantinople stated that the Turks only acted in legitimate defence, and that the revolutionary committees were responsible for the existing state of things. Later in the year, at the instigation of the revolutionary committees, Miss Stone, the American missionary, was captured, and a large accession was by this means obtained to the funds of the committees. In 1902 the complaints from independent sources continued, and in the early part of that year negotiations upon the condition of Macedonia began to appear. In February last year our Ambassador at Vienna wrote or telegraphed to the noble Marquess stating that the Austrian Government were getting perturbed about the state of things, and that he had been assured by the Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs that a "loyal exchange of views"—which implies extremely leisurely proceedings—was going on between the Austrian and the Russian Governments. Then the Austrian Ambassador in London complained of the proceedings, and asked the noble Marquess what he thought ought to be done and the noble Marquess, with, if I may say so, great good sense, replied that it was a matter which more concerned Austria than other countries, and that whatever scheme Austria proposed he thought His Majesty's Government would be prepared to support. All this time the Greek Government and others were complaining of the intolerable condition to which the action of the Bulgarian Committees had brought Macedonia.

In the autumn of last year a fresh impetus was given to the agitation by the Shipka celebrations, and later in the year the Russian Ambassador at Constantinople called the attention of the Sultan to the state of Macedonia, and offered to draw up a memorandum of reforms. The Sultan appears to have objected, and to have replied that he had himself prepared a scheme of reforms. He produced his scheme, and it was at once apparent that it was useless, because it contained no provision for securing the regular payment of any of the officials. In January of this year the noble Marquess, feeling that things were approaching a climax, wrote to our Ambassador at Constantinople that the condition of the population in this portion of the Turkish Empire had become intolerable. Meanwhile, the Russian and Austrian Governments were continuing to loyally exchange views, and they at last produced a scheme of reforms, to the principle of which the noble Marquess immediately assented, reserving to himself the right to suggest modifications if necessary. This scheme, which was presented to the Sultan and immediately accepted, is of an extremely simple and, I might say, obvious nature, and, without flattering the noble Marquess, I think I could undertake to say that he and one of his subordinates, say the British Ambassador at Constantinople, could have produced an equally good scheme in half-an-hour.

The scheme merely amounts to this—that there shall be an Inspector-General appointed who is to be maintained for a fixed period of years, that the Valis, or principal Governors, are to be made to obey him, that foreign experts are to reorganise the gendarmerie, that there is to be an amnesty for political prisoners, and, finally, that the revenue of the three vilayets—Salonica, Monastir, and Üsküb, is to be spent, in the first place, for the benefit of these provinces. This modest scheme was immediately accepted by the Sultan, who, in addition, announced his intention of introducing similar reforms into other provinces, and this extreme readiness on the part of the Sultan appears, not unnaturally, to have excited a certain amount of misgiving. As I have said, this is an extremely simple scheme. It can hardly be dignified by the name of a reform; but, modest as it is, it fulfils all the requirements of the situation. Although it may seem an absurd thing to say, reforms, as the term is generally understood, are not what are required in Turkey, and, indeed, are impossible. What is wanted in that country is efficient administration, and I understand that is the line taken by the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. It must occur to everybody that it was strange that so small a scheme should not have been produced last year, and thus have saved the lives of many innocent people and much bloodshed.

But what we have to consider is the future, and the important point is whether the scheme is going to be allowed a fair chance. If it is, it is possible that it will lead to a tolerable state of things, and more than that cannot be expected. But it will be impossible for the scheme to work so long as the revolutionary committees are allowed to continue. They certainly will not accept it, and will do their best to defeat it, and it appears to me that the only chance of dealing successfully with the getting rid of these revolutionary committees is to deal directly with the Bulgarian Government. I am quite aware of the difficulties which that Government have to face in attempting to get rid of the committees. In the first place nearly everybody in Bulgaria sympathises with them. There are a very large number of Macedonians, not only in Bulgaria, but in Government employment. A large number of the officials also are Macedonians, and we must not forget this fact, that by the Treaty of San Stefano nearly all the territory, the condition of which we are considering at the present moment, was allotted to Bulgaria, and ever since that day it has been looked upon as a kind of Bulgaria Irredenta, and it always will be the object of the Bulgarian Government to try and recover the territory which was allotted to them by the Treaty of San Stefano. I recognise the difficulty which the Bulgarian Government have to face, but at the same time the interests of peace are considerably more important, and, personally, I see no reason why the aspirations of Bulgaria should form a menace to the peace of Europe.

I hope, therefore, to hear from the noble Marquess the statement that the signatory Powers are prepared to exercise whatever pressure may be necessary, at all risks, to insist upon the Bulgarian Government doing their best to secure that the peace shall be maintained. We are told that danger is passed, that Austria and Russia are determined on a solution of the difficulty, and that therefore peace will be kept. I do not wish to appear as a prophet of evil, but I cannot help seeing in the present situation an ominous resemblance to that which existed in 1877. The Turks were then attempting to suppress insurrection in the European provinces. At that period we were told, and, I believe, truly told, that the Emperor of Russia and the Russian Government were not desirous of war, but the condition of their co-religionists in Turkey so acted on the Slav population that the Emperor of Russia of that day was driven to war, and the Russo-Turkish war was the result. It is conceivable that such may be the case again, and if the Turks retaliate by massacre on a severe scale it will be impossible to restrain the active sympathy of Slavs in the other countries of Europe, and the experience of 1877 may be repeated. In these circumstances, and as I do not think we are justified in taking a too optimistic view of the situation, I think that a statement from the noble Marquess would be appropriate at the present moment; and, whilst I apologise to your Lordships for the length of my observations, I hardly think it necessary to apologise for having called attention to a question which is really of great European importance.

THE LORD BISHOP OF HEREFORD: My Lords, I hope I may be permitted to put a simple supplementary inquiry to the noble Marquess. We have just listened to what has been to me a very instructive and interesting speech, but, at the same time, it has not relieved me of the feeling which has induced me to address an inquiry to the noble Marquess. Like many other persons I too have read the Blue-book containing the recent correspondence respecting the affairs of South-Eastern Europe, but I do not profess fully to understand what is meant by many of the phrases in the diplomatic correspondence. I am not accustomed to the language of diplomacy, but I do not think it requires any great amount of imagination, as one reads between the lines, to realise that the condition of Macedonia must be intolerable to those who live in it. In order to better understand the state of affairs in that country I turn from the Blue-book to what I might venture to call a "Red-book." I refer to an article entitled "The Reign of Terror in Macedonia," which appears in the *Contemporary Review* of the present month, signed by a well-known Englishman to whom we have owed some similar descriptions in the past, and which, so far as I know, have always been authenticated, and therefore I feel that his description deserves possibly no less serious attention than the diplomatic correspondence in the Blue-book. I would venture to call the noble Marquess's attention to one or two parts of this article. I will confine myself to citing the evidence of two witnesses, and in doing so I will start from Communication No. 337, on page 266 of the Blue-book. That is a letter from Mr. Elliot to the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, dated December 12th last, stating that Madame Bakhmeteff, an American lady, the wife of the Russian Agent at Sofia, had started on a relief expedition, and it is admitted at the end of the letter that up to November 6th no particular harm seems to have been done, but that after that time the Turkish troops got out of hand. This lady appears to have taken with her on her beneficent mission a member of the Russian Embassy and two Russian nurses. The Blue-book does not tell us anything as to what she found, but Mr. Dillon, in the article to which I have referred, quotes her own memorandum, which states that she found no less than 961 refugees, besides learning of some hundreds who had sought refuge in another district. From one district alone—Razlog—no less than 1,500 able-bodied men had been driven, and this, as far as I can gather, is a loyal and well-conducted district, and one which is free from those malignant influences to which the noble Lord referred. In this district this lady found that there were fourteen churches with twenty-two priests; of the latter, eight escaped to Bulgaria, one was killed, one arrested, and the fate of the remainder is unknown. According to her statement the churches were defiled and destroyed by the Turks, and a considerable number of the remaining peasants are said to have perished on the way over the mountains. The article proceeds—

> "Over one-third, therefore, of the male population of the best-behaved district of Macedonia has been thus forced to flee the country."

Dr. Dillon naturally asks—

> "Have the Powers who exhorted the Christians to keep the peace and await the coming reforms reflected on the fate in store for those who act on that advice?"

Madame Bakhmeteff travelled about in this district bringing succour to the fugitives, and the writer of the article in the *Contemporary Review* has her authority for saying that two priests of the villages of Oranoff and Padesh were tortured in a manner which suggests the story of St. Lawrence's death; they were not exactly laid on gridirons, but they were hung over a fire and burned with red-hot irons. Madame Bakhmeteff goes on to say—

> "The horror of the situation is intensified by the fact that large numbers of fugitives have been driven back by the Turks into the interior southwards towards Seres, where their horrible sufferings, and their miserable end will be hidden from all who might give them help or pity."

Dr. Dillon's article asserts that the Great Powers are not ignorant of these facts; that details far more harrowing are in their possession; that the representatives of Great Britain, Austria, and Italy called at the Russian Embassy and took copious extracts from this lady's memoranda, which they forwarded to their respective Governments, and that Tsar Nicholas, on hearing the facts, at once sent 10,000 roubles for those fugitives who had escaped with their lives into Bulgaria.

That is a part of the Report of one witness. I will now quote from another witness, Mr. Westman, the Russian Vice-Consul at Philippopolis, who, in order to verify the incredible statements of many of the fugitives, crossed over into Macedonia, and the startling results of his investigation were sent to the Foreign Office in St. Petersburg. I hardly like to trouble your Lordships with quotations from his evidence, but he speaks of a belt of territory thirty versts broad, running parallel to the frontier, as typifying the abomination of desolation. The churches, he says, had been defiled, and the villages partly burned to the ground, while the inhabitants had fled no one knows whither. In the interior of the country, Mr. Westman repeated that the situation is said to be equally bad, but he had no means of verifying this statement. He beheld quite enough, however, to perceive that the era of reforms is being inaugurated in a very incongruous fashion. Mr. Westman declares that he saw women who had run away to save their honour and their lives, and were huddled together in mountain fastnesses where the snow lay several feet deep, and the wretched creatures were in an almost naked state. Forty of these women, he adds, were about to become mothers. He met tiny, bright-eyed little girls with disfigured faces fitfully crying, fitfully quivering in every limb, with manifest signs of having been terribly outraged. Of the persons he saw, several were mutilated or disfigured, and the livid welts, the open wounds, the horrible marks of the red-hot pincers with which they had been tortured, were, he states, witnessed by all. He adds—

> "It was especially heart-rending to see mothers covered with scanty rags which could not shield from the bitter cold the helpless babes who were slowly dying at their milkless breasts."

I venture to put this evidence side by side with the diplomatic evidence contained in the Blue-book, and to ask the noble Marquess, Can nothing be done? In reading the Blue-book no one can fail to recognise with thankfulness and pride as Englishmen the tone of the noble Marquess's correspondence; but to plain people like myself all over the country the question is constantly recurring, Can nothing be done to stop this in the neighbourhood of ancient Greece, in the heart of Europe? I have nothing to say for the revolutionary committees in Bulgaria to which the noble Lord who has just spoken referred. He is inclined apparently to throw the bulk of the responsibility on these committees. If the account which the noble Lord has given is correct their behaviour is atrocious; but, human nature being what it is, what can be expected so long as you allow the state of things in Macedonia to remain what it is? So long as you have misgovernment and atrocity and infamy such as described in Dr. Dillon's article, you may depend upon having revolutionary committees. I would venture to quote a word of Dr. Dillon's as to that. He says, very truly, that Turkey is in an almost impossible position. Of her own motion she can hardly cure these things, so that we must not, I think, throw the ultimate responsibility even on the Sultan of Turkey. That is how it strikes a plain man. Turning to Bulgaria, I venture to think that many of your Lordships will concur with Dr. Dillon when he says:—

> "Bulgaria, despite the asseverations and the really correct attitude of the Premier, M. Daneff, cannot remain an onlooker while people of her own flesh and blood are being tortured, violated, murdered. As a line of political conduct this attitude would be dangerous; in ethics, it would be less defensible still. But, whatever it might be in theory, in practice it is impossible."

I think it will be agreed that the really responsible persons are the great Powers of Europe. They, if they choose, can alter this state of things, and the responsibility, therefore, unless I am mistaken in my conception of the matter, must rest upon them. I am sure there is not a single noble Lord in this House who does not feel that this state of things is a shame and a disgrace—it is a disgrace to every anointed and crowned Emperor and King in Christian Europe, and to every Government and Minister who supports the policy. I venture to think I may say that without being charged with exaggeration, and if the noble Marquess, following out the spirit which we know moves him in the matter, is able to do anything to bring about an improved situation in that unhappy country, he will have added great lustre to his own name and to the name of the country he serves. A long time since some of us had hoped that the policy which was once described by one of the greatest of Englishmen as the "bag and baggage policy" might be carried into effect. We were young, some of us, in those days; and now we are old, and things are now apparently as bad as ever; but still we pray that statesmen may arise in the different countries of Europe who will, for very shame, say that the cup has run over, and that the time has come for taking whatever steps may be necessary to put an end to a condition of things so discreditable to Christian Europe. I beg to ask the noble Marquess if he can give us any hope that this better state of affairs will be realised in the near future.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The MARQUESS of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, the noble Lord who has raised this question has called the attention of your Lordships to a question which for many years past has added greatly to our pre-occupations, and which during the last few months has given us cause for the most acute anxiety. His Majesty's Government cannot be indifferent to the condition of things which he has described, and which has been referred to by the right rev. Prelate who has just spoken. This country has treaty rights, and, indeed, treaty obligations, which forbid her to look with an indifferent eye upon the events which have happened lately in the Balkan peninsula; and, quite without reference to those treaty obligations, we have to bear in mind that a conflagration in that part of Europe is likely to have far-reaching results, and to produce international difficulties of the most grave and momentous character. And, apart from such considerations as these, there certainly must arise in the breast of every one of us a feeling of deep commiseration for the unhappy populations which, year after year, have suffered owing to the lamentable condition, social and political, of the country which they inhabit. My Lords, the noble Lord who spoke first laid the greater blame on the Bulgarians and their committees. The right rev. Prelate, on the contrary, is disposed to regard the Turkish Government as mainly culpable. I trust we shall not regard these questions merely as questions between Christians and Mussulmans. There are Mussulmans who suffer as much from the condition of what is commonly spoken of as Macedonia as any of the Christian inhabitants of those regions.

With regard to the noble Lord's indictment of the Bulgarian Committees, I entirely agree with him in thinking that to a certain extent these regrettable events have been due to their mischievous activity. But that activity would not have produced the results which have actually followed if the soil had not been prepared by the long-standing misgovernment and maladministration of the Turkish Government. The noble Lord dwelt with force upon the close connection between Bulgaria and Macedonia. That connection cannot be left out of account. I believe I am right in saying that about one-half of the officials in Bulgaria are persons of Macedonian origin, and that of the officers in the Bulgarian army about one-third are persons of Macedonian origin. It is, of course, impossible for these people to regard with indifference the misgovernment and maltreatment of those who are their fellow-countrymen, and who happen to live on the Turkish side of the frontier. It is satisfactory to know that lately there has been evidence to show that the Bulgarian Government has realised the seriousness of the risk likely to result from the action of these committees, and has taken measures to discourage the agitation which they have produced. His Majesty's Government, as the noble Lord is aware, have constantly, through their Agent at Sofia, made representations to the Bulgarian Government upon this subject, and impressed on them in the most earnest manner the duty of keeping these insurrectionary movements in check.

Then the right rev. Prelate referred to the incidents which took place in the district of Razlog; and he supplemented the information with regard to those incidents which is contained in the Blue-book, by much ampler and more vivid and painful descriptions gathered from an article which has lately appeared in one of the monthly reviews in this country. I do not think the right rev. Prelate can complain of us for having attempted to slur over these Razlog occurrences in the Blue-book we have presented to Parliament. He has himself referred to the fact that these outrages were reported to us by Mr. Elliot in the month of December. Mr. Elliot, and it is greatly to his credit, at once set to work to collect from the American missionaries, who had exceptional opportunities of acquainting themselves with the facts of the case, all the information which was procurable, and a fortnight later he forwarded to us the reports which he had received.

On 30th December, His Majesty's Government addressed a despatch by telegraph to Sir Nicholas O'Conor, and desired him to call the attention of the Porte in the strongest manner to the gravity of these occurrences. Sir Nicholas O'Conor was desired to impress on the Porte that—

> "If excesses of this kind are permitted the results could not fail to be disastrous to the interests of Turkey, and that it appears desirable that prompt measures of precaution should be taken."

Sir Nicholas O'Conor had already of his own motion made very earnest representations to the Porte on the subject of these Razlog outrages, and when he received the telegram of which I have just spoken he repeated his remonstrances in no less strong terms. That despatch was received on 6th January, and the last paper in this Blue-book is dated 9th January. Therefore, obviously no information of a later date could have been placed in the Blue-book. But I am able to tell the right rev. Prelate that Mr. Elliot has been instructed to verify these reports as far as possible, and they have been sent by him for comparison with other reports from different sources which have reached our Consul-General at Salonika. The result of these investigations is at this moment being laid before His Majesty's Government. I shall, I hope, in a few days present further Papers, and I shall consider whether it is possible to include amongst them any documents giving further information upon this subject.

But I desire at this stage to tell your Lordships that while, so far as I can gather, there is no doubt that a number of these poor people were driven out of their homes in circumstances of great hardship, there is reason to doubt whether the accounts of the outrages themselves, of the abominable tortures and injuries inflicted on some of them, are not very greatly exaggerated. That has been, I think, our experience in the case of all former epidemics of this kind. There is generally a foundation of fact, but too often the published accounts are designedly and deliberately magnified.

Then, my Lords, the noble Lord referred to the fact that of late two of the

European Powers have been specially interesting themselves in the question of Macedonian reform. The two Powers—Austria-Hungary and Russia—did so with the knowledge and acquiescence of the other Powers. I think I may say of them, as I may say of His Majesty's Government, that we felt that those two Powers, owing to their proximity to the regions in which those disorders were imminent, and owing to the exceptional facilities they possess for putting direct pressure upon Bulgaria on the one side and Turkey on the other, that these two Powers were in a position of special advantage for dealing with the question; and we therefore readily acquiesced in their doing so. The result of this action has been the production, somewhat tardily I agree, of the scheme of reforms which is described in the Papers before your Lordships. We do not regard that scheme of reforms as being in any sense a complete or perfect scheme. Indeed, I do not suppose the framers of the scheme themselves would for a moment contend that it could be so described; but it certainly contains many useful provisions; and it will have the effect of bringing some relief to the intolerable tension which has been created in the Balkan Peninsula. I confess that for myself I am not disposed to complain of the scheme merely on account of the comparative modesty of the proposals embodied in it. Our experience has shown us the futility of great and ambitious schemes of reforms. What we want is not so much ambitious schemes of reforms on paper as honesty on the part of those who make these professions of a desire to improve matters and the ability to fulfil the expectations which are held out. I believe it is well known that the existing code of law which obtains in Turkey is a very admirable code. It was drafted by European jurists of repute on the basis of well-known European codes; but the difficulty has always been that the men are not there to give effect to the legislative provisions, and that seems to me the difficulty which we have to foresee in the future. The attitude of His Majesty's Government towards the scheme has not differed from that of other Powers signatory to the Treaty of Berlin. We recognised that above all things delay was dangerous at such a moment; we had no cut-and-dried scheme of our own to offer to Turkey or to the Powers as an alternative to this scheme; we recognised in this scheme many useful and hopeful provisions. And in these circumstances it seemed to us that no course was open to us except to accept the scheme in principle—but, of course, reserving to ourselves the right of suggesting hereafter any modifications which experience might show to be necessary, should the original scheme disappoint the anticipations of its framers. We shall watch its operation closely. We have already given instructions that our Consuls, who have throughout these events kept us fully supplied with information, are from time to time to report as to the progress of these measures; and I can assure the right rev. Prelate that, so far as our opportunities permit, we shall spare no pains to secure the execution of these reforms, which are certainly good as far as they go. But it is useless to disguise from ourselves that there are many difficulties in the way, and that no reforms, be they extensive or moderate in their scope, are likely to succeed unless you are met with great self-restraint on the part of these suffering populations, unless you can count upon greater energy and a much more just appreciation of the gravity of the situation on the part of the Porte, and unless the attitude of the great Powers is one of single-hearted disinterestedness towards the whole question. I earnestly trust that those conditions may be found present in this case, and that this project may prove beneficial in itself, and also that it may be the foundation of still more far-reaching and important measures of amelioration.

*EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I do not rise to criticise in any way the speech of the noble Marquess, or the conduct of these negotiations as shown in the papers laid before Parliament. The noble Marquess has, I think, shown that he is perfectly aware of all the difficulties in this case. He has spoken of the injustice done to these populations, and I think he is fully aware of the misgovernment of the Porte. I think it right to impress on the Government that the people in this country have a deep and strong feeling on this subject. They sympathise very deeply with the suffering populations under the rule of Turkey, not only in Macedonia, but in other parts of the Turkish dominions. The noble Marquess has very forcibly illustrated the position of the Bulgarian Government. It would be beyond what could justly be expected of humanity if the Macedonians in Bulgaria were not very much moved when they know that over the border their fellow-countrymen are being so grievously oppressed. The right rev. Prelate represented, I think very truly, the general feeling in this country, although I cannot go quite as far as he did in regard to the responsibility of the Sultan, because I cannot help thinking that the Sultan has the great and chief responsibility for all these acts of misgovernment, which are such a danger to the peace of Europe, and which he could remedy with a stroke of the pen. At the same time, a great responsibility does rest upon the great Powers to see that the remedies applied by the Sultan are effective. The noble Lord who raised the question rightly said that this evil has been simmering for years; and I wish that diplomacy had shown more activity and foresight in taking earlier steps to remedy a state of things which is a danger not only to the provinces themselves, but to the whole of Europe. So far as I follow the noble Marquess in his despatches and his speech, he seems quite alive to the difficulties and responsibilities of the position, and I sincerely hope that he will lose no opportunity, in conjunction with other Powers, of seeing that the Sultan carries out the reforms he has undertaken, and if they are not satisfactory, that still more effective measures will be pressed for.

THE MILITIA BALLOT BILL [H.L.]

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: My Lords, I beg to ask His Majesty's Government whether, inasmuch as their attention is being directed to home defence and military organisation, they intend to re-introduce the Bill presented four years ago by Lord Lansdowne, the then Secretary for War, to amend the existing obsolete Militia Ballot Act, and bring it up to date. In 1898 and 1899 there was considerable discussion upon the question of the existing military system which rests, as your Lordships know, upon the inalienable right of the Crown to call upon British subjects for home defence compulsorily, the ballot being an alleviation of that right of compulsory service. The noble Marquess when Secretary of State for War said, in referring to the existing law, that this was a power with which he would very unwillingly part, but that the law was in a very unsatisfactory state. He was then asked if he would bring in a Bill on the subject, and declined; but in the following year he laid on the Table the Bill to which I now refer. Seeing that His Majesty's Government are taking the question of our home defence and military organisation in hand, and that our whole military system rests upon the law which my noble friend has amended and brought up to date, I beg to ask the Question standing in my name.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of HARDWICKE): My Lords, whatever the criticism levelled against the Army administration of this country may be, and however inconsistent we may sometimes consider it, I do not think any Member of your Lordships' House can accuse the noble Earl on the Cross Benches of being inconsistent in the views he holds with regard to our military requirements. I would like, also, to show the House that His Majesty's Government have not been inconsistent in regard to the introduction of the Bill to which the noble Earl refers. The Question, as it stands on the Paper, might lead your Lordships to believe that His Majesty's Government had intended to legislate on this subject and had then drawn back.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: I never said more than that they introduced the Bill.

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE: I accept that, but I merely suggest that it is possible that some noble Lords and the public may be led to think that we have been inconsistent. I would, therefore, like to read a few of the remarks that were made by the noble Marquess on the occasion of the pledge he gave to the noble Earl to introduce legislation. Lord Lansdowne said—

> "I am ready to say that we shall, during the coming autumn, have that machinery"—

He was referring to the existing Militia Act—

> "carefully examined and revised. It will be so much at any rate gained if we have at the War Office, ready to hand, a carefully and thoroughly worked out scheme for giving effect to the ballot should it become indispensable. But I wish to guard myself against being supposed to undertake that we shall endeavour to pass into law a Bill for the introduction of the ballot; that is a pledge I am certainly not prepared to give."

In the Speech from the Throne in the following year there was no mention of a Militia Bill, but in the course of the summer the noble Marquess did introduce a measure on the subject, and, in doing so, he made the following remarks—

> "I promised the noble Earl, whom I see on the Cross Benches, that we would, during the Recess, examine and revise the machinery of the Ballot Acts, with the object of having ready to our hand the means of putting the ballot into operation, should we ever be driven to resort to it. I guarded myself at the same time from undertaking that we should this year or at any particular moment endeavour to pass into law a Bill for the introduction of the ballot. Since this pledge was given we have examined the existing law, as well as the Bill submitted to the House last year by the noble Lord, which was in fact a reproduction of the clauses and schedules which had been included in the original draft of Lord Cardwell's Army Bill of 1871, but were dropped in the House of Commons. I am now prepared to lay before the House a Bill dealing with the subject, not, as I have explained, with any idea that such a Bill can be passed into law immediately or in the near future, but because I concur with the noble Earl in thinking that it is desirable that we should realise how we stand in regard to compulsion, and what sort of case can be made out for resorting to it, and if it were to be resorted to, in what shape it could be most conveniently applied, and with what probable results."

I have merely read these remarks of the noble Marquess in order to show your Lordships for what purpose this Bill was introduced. If, at any future time, it is considered necessary to introduce legislation on the subject, the War Office has all the machinery at hand.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: The machinery does not exist.

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE: Well, we have the material for making the machinery. I would point out to the noble Earl that if legislation on this subject were introduced we would naturally require a very large number of officers. His Majesty's Government have recently agreed to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the pay, terms of service, and efficiency of the Militia and Volunteer forces, and to report as to what modification of the existing conditions is necessary. I have no doubt that the Commission would gratefully avail themselves of the noble Earl's experience and knowledge if he offers to give evidence; and if the Commission recommend that a Bill of the nature the noble Earl desires to see passed into law is necessary, I have no doubt that the matter will receive careful consideration; but legislation is not considered necessary at present.

EARL CARRINGTON: How many officers are short in the Militia at present?

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE: A considerable number.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: The state of things is just this—that the present Militia Act is absolutely obsolete, and of no use at all. The materials are there, but this Bill is necessary to put those materials together and make the machinery workable. I do not ask the Government when they have got that machinery in order to apply it; but it seems to me to be absurd and ridiculous to keep an obsolete Act upon the Statute Book, to suspend it annually, and to refuse to proceed with a Bill presented by the Secretary of State for bringing that Act up-to-date. I therefore propose to bring in the Bill myself. The only change I have made is to substitute my name on the back of it for that of the noble Marquess, and after Easter I shall certainly take a division upon it, whether it be read a second time or not.

Moved, "That this Bill be now read 1^a."—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

MILITIA BALLOT BILL [H.L.]

On Question, Bill read 1^a, and to be printed (No. 14.)

MARINE INSURANCE BILL [H.L.].

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The EARL of HALSBURY) in moving the Second Reading of this Bill explained that it was intended to codify the law relating to marine insurance. He regretted that this was the third time he had introduced this very desirable measure, which had been prevented from becoming law by obstruction in the House of Commons. The Bill was the outcome of a conference on this subject between shipowners, underwriters, and merchants, who were unanimous in expressing the hope that it would become law during the present session. The noble and learned Lord read extracts from letters received by him in order to show the great interest taken in the subject, and earnestly pressing that the Bill should be passed. These letters were from Lloyd's, the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom, the Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce, the Association of Average Adjusters, the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom, the Liverpool Underwriters' Association, and the Shipowners' Parliamentary Committee.

*EARL RUSSELL called attention to sub-Section (*b*) of Clause 4, which provided that a contract of marine insurance should be deemed to be a gaming or wagering contract if in the body of the policy there occurred certain words. He would like to ask the noble and learned Lord whether it was the intention to render a policy void from the mere fact of its containing these words—and it was quite possible that a careless draughtsman might, in copying an old policy, insert these technical words—even if there had been a proper insurable interest. Again, sub-Section 1 of Clause 16 provided that the insurable value in the case of a steamship included also the machinery and boilers. He would have thought that this was obvious, but if it was necessary to insert this provision in the case of steamships would it not be desirable to insert words providing that vessels propelled by other forms of mechanical power, such as modern explosion engines, should have their machinery covered?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR replied that contracts of marine insurance were seldom entered into by persons who were unacquainted with the technical terms, and he was afraid he could not hold out any hope that, if technical terms were used, it would be possible hereafter to say they were inserted by mistake. Practically, the question would not arise, because the parties concerned would take good care that the documents they executed were in proper form. With regard to the other point raised by the noble Lord he thought some question might arise upon it when the Bill was in Committee, but he did not think that at present he could give any advantageous explanation of it.

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

House adjourned at five minutes past Six o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 13th March, 1903.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz.—

Lancashire and Yorkshire and London and North Western Railways (Steam Vessels) Bill.

North Eastern Railway Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

WIGAN CORPORATION TRAMWAYS.

Petition for additional provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE BILL.

Petition from London, against; to lie upon the Table.

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.

Petition from Walsall, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.

Petition from Bristol, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Dreghorn; Auchindoir; and Tarbolton; to lie upon the Table.

FRANCHISE AND REMOVAL OF WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL.

Petition from Leamington, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petitions against: from South Stoneham; Northampton; Mountain Ash; Pontardawe; Battersea; Swindon; Barrow-in-Furness; Cerne; Lewisham; Willington Quay; Guisborough; West Ham; and Sunderland; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petition from Thornhill, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Radcliffe, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

RAILWAY, ETC., BILLS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 12th March; *Mr. Gerald Balfour*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 73.]

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) (CODE 1903).

Copy presented, of Code of Regulations for Day Schools, 1903, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MINES AND QUARRIES.

Copy presented, of General Report and Statistics for the year 1901, Part IV., Colonial and Foreign Statistics; Statistics relating to Persons employed, Output, and Accidents at Mines and Quarries in the British Colonies and Foreign Countries [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY.

Copy presented, of Evidence of Lieutenant-Colonel D. A. Kinloch, C.B., M.V.O., before the Court of Inquiry held by the Order of the General Officer Commanding the Home District on 14th December 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Charles Ramsay Devlin, esquire, for the Borough of Galway.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of Surrey (North Western or Chertsey Division), in the room of Henry Currie Leigh-Bennett, esquire, deceased.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Army Estimates—Increased Pay.

SIR EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter): To ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the recent increase of the Army and of modifications in terms of pay and pension, any calculation has been made as to the future effect of these changes on the non-effective Votes of the Army Estimates.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) In all schemes for increases to the Army calculations are always made as to the non-effective charges that will result therefrom. It is not clear to what increase reference is made, but the recent modifications in the terms of service and pay are not expected to cause any addition to the non-effective Votes of the Army.

Cunard Agreement.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the First

Lord of the Treasury if he can inform the House in what form, and when, the assent of Parliament is to be asked to the Cunard agreement.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am afraid it is not probable that the Cunard agreement can be laid on the Table before Easter. When it is laid I will consider in what form the opinion of the House can be taken upon it.

Private Bill Procedure.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will, with a view to lessening the work of Private Committees and to diminish the cost of promoting Private Bills, introduce legislation in order to bring up to date the General Public Health Legislation of England and Wales, in accordance with the recommendation No. 28 in the Report of the Select Committee on Private Business.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) As I informed the hon. Member for Rushcliffe this week,† the question of what steps should be taken in connection with the recommendations of the Select Committee on Private Business is one which must be deferred until the Government have had an opportunity of consulting the Chairman of Committees upon his return to the House.

South African War—Sea Transport Medal.

CAPTAIN JESSEL (St. Pancras, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether all officers of ships conveying troops during the South African War are eligible for the sea transport medal; and, if not, whether he could consider the advisability of including those who were not serving on Government transports.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) As stated in my reply on the 17th November last ‡ to the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, the issue of the medal is confined to troop transports on time charter, which are entirely at the disposal of the Government for service in any direction, and the masters and officers of which are for the time being practically the servants of the Crown. The Admiralty do not propose to make any change such as that suggested in the regulations governing the award of the medal.

Navy—Promotion of Warrant Officers to Lieutenants.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, under the new Navy Scheme, warrant officers will suffer in their prospects of promotion to lieutenant's rank by reason of being near their time for retiring from the Service.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The answer is in the negative.

Royal Marines.

MR. LOCKIE (Devonport): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will consider the advisability of arranging that the present officers of the Royal Marines should have the option under the new scheme of completing their service on the terms under which they joined, of being turned over to the Army, or of being pensioned now at a proportionate rate to which they would have been entitled if they had completed their term of service.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) As the officers at present serving in the Royal Marines will complete their service on the terms under which they joined, except as regards their pay, which has been increased, no question arises of any such option as that mentioned in the Question.

Police and Sanitary Regulation Committee.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state why the Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulation Bills was not appointed during either of the past two years; and whether it has been determined to discontinue the Committee.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) Many circumstances prevented the appointment of this Committee during the past two years. One of the greatest difficulties in the way was, I believe, to find Members willing to serve on this Committee, as the number of attendances which would be required of them was much greater than that on an ordinary Private Bill Committee. Every effort is now being made to overcome this and other difficulties, and I hope that it will be possible to reappoint this Committee.

---

† See page 389.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, cxiv., 1105.

Education Act — Payment of Grants—Betton Charity.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether it is intended to frame a scheme for the future regulation of that part of the Betton Charity which is at present applied in aid of the funds of elementary schools in England and Wales; and, if not, whether these grants will, after the appointed day, be paid to the managers of the schools or to the local education authorities.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The Ironmongers' Company, as trustees of Betton's Charity, are now engaged in framing a scheme for the future regulation of that part of this charity which is at present applied by them in aid of the funds of elementary schools in England and Wales.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE BILL.

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, Toxteth, E.): In moving the Second Reading of the Church Discipline Bill I must ask this House to go back with me to the 10th May, 1899. A period somewhat distant in point of time, and still more distant in point of the magnitude of the affairs which have happened since that date. It was on that date that this House debated the question of certain practices in the Established Church of this country, and came to an important decision and resolution upon that subject. That Resolution was as follows—

> "That this House, while not prepared to accept a measure which creates fresh offences and ignores the authority of the Bishops in maintaining the discipline of the Church, is of opinion that if the efforts now being made by the Archbishops and Bishops to secure the due obedience of the clergy are not speedily effectual, further legislation will be required to maintain the observance of the existing laws of Church and Realm."

We may possibly congratulate ourselves that when the feeling of this country was so strongly aroused on the question of ritualistic practices in the Church of England, no legislation took place upon that occasion. Every Member of the House will agree with me that in matters of deep and vital importance this House should not act in haste, and although some of us at that time thought a case for legislation was made out, it is not perhaps to be regretted that four years have elapsed since last this question was debated. I think that having read this Resolution, for which I call special attention, in that it refers clearly to the "efforts now being made by the Archbishops and Bishops to secure due obedience of the clergy, are not speedily effected, further legislation will be required," I may take it that this House has affirmed its right to initiate legislation of this kind in connection with the National Church. Therefore I consider myself absolved from the necessity of arguing that point, and ask the House to take this Resolution of 10th May, 1899, which affirms the right of Parliament to initiate legislation. I shall proceed, with the consent of the House, to consider how far the efforts of the Archbishops and the Bishops have been successful in securing the obedience of the clergy, but before I go further into details of this matter, I wish to make one remark, which I specially address to hon. Members below the Gangway, on whom some of the observations, I shall feel obliged to make, may jar. I wish to say at once, fairly and frankly, that it is with some reluctance that I debate matters sacred to religion in this House, and desire to say that in doing so I attack no man's religious convictions, and that if any remarks I make should jar on the Roman Catholic Members of this House, I hope they will understand I am not attacking the sacred rights and ceremonies which may have their proper and stated place in their religion, but that I am challenging the attempt to force in the Established Reformed Church of this country practices which we thought at one time were for ever abandoned at the Reformation.

Now we have to consider the question of how far the efforts of the Archbishops and the Bishops have been successful in securing due obedience of the clergy, and upon that I should like to refer for a moment to an important statement made recently by a distinguished member of the Government, which indicates that the Government has not that confidence in the Episcopal Bench which perhaps some of us have thought existed. The statement that I am alluding to was made by the Duke of Devonshire, and it says—

> "He could not say that the declaration that had been made from the Episcopal Bench was sufficiently explicit to enable him to accept the Amendment. If the bishops possess this power why had it not been exercised before? These cases which they all had in their minds had taken place in schools under Trust Deeds, securing a right of appeal to the Bishop, but had any of their Lordships ever heard of the proceedings of an indiscreet clergyman in the school being restrained by the Episcopal Authorities. He could not understand why it should be found more easy for the Right Reverend Bench in future to exercise the necessary control over their clergy in this respect than it had been found in the past."

Those are the utterances of a leading member of the Government, recently expressed, and indicative, so far as he is concerned, of incapacity, or of distrust, if nothing more, of the power of the English Bishops to restrain these practices. I want now to turn the attention of the House to the utterances of another gentleman of some note in the ecclesiastical world, Mr. Athelstan Riley. I do not accept all he says, but I think his observations from his own point of view of the state of affairs are deserving of the notice of this House. Mr. Athelstan Riley, after certain opinions were offered by the Archbishops for the acceptance of the Church, made some observations on the way in which they had been met. He said it was two years since the opinion was issued which condemned the use of incense in divine service, and about a year and a half since the condemnation by the Archbishops of reservation was promulgated, and he went on to say, that from his point of view—which I take it is the point of view of the clergy who indulge in these practices, and which is the point of view of an enormous body of the clergy through the length and breadth of England—

> "the gain was enormous; when a state of things was legalised in London, it was only a question of a little patience and time before it would be recognised the length and breadth of England,"

and I think I may be forgiven in this connection if I quote the opinion of one more hon. Member of this House, whom I am sure we all hold in the greatest esteem, the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich. Recently the noble Lord went down to the Canterbury House of Laymen with a Bill in his pocket about which I may have something to say in a few moments, and practically told that body that the state of affairs in the Church of England was one of absolute anarchy.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): Hear, hear!

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR: I welcome that cheer, which represents the general consensus of opinion in this House that, notwithstanding the efforts of the Archbishops and Bishops to restrain this practice, the condition of things in the Church now is nothing more nor less than anarchy. I do not want to labour the point as regards the condition of anarchy of the National Church of this country, but I am obliged to go a little more into detail in this matter with regard to the use of incense and the practice of reservation. I say that the use of incense in churches since the Lambeth decision has not decreased in any substantial degree; there may have been a modification in the use of incense, but I do not think I need go into particulars to show that.

I should be wasting the time of this House if I were to dwell upon the matter, but I assert, according to the latest figures we have, that whereas in 1898–9 incense was used in 381 churches, in 1901–2 it was used in 393 churches. I hold in my hand a statement which shows that in February of this year the Bishop of London practically says that he cannot but recognise the claim to special consideration which is constituted by the fact that the use of incense and the custom of reserving the Sacred Elements of the Holy Communion have been observed for a number of years, and that he had hoped to be able to define certain uniform limits within which, in exceptional cases, these usages might be permitted. Might I interject here that I cannot understand why, after these things have been declared illegal in conclave by the Primate of the Established Church of this country, the Bishop of a diocese should find it necessary to tolerate them in any shape or form. Then the statement goes on:

> "But after much earnest thought I have come to the conclusion that it is not possible for me to adopt this course. I do not indeed propose myself to take any active measures against the continuance of such modified use of incense and manner of reservation as shall conform to the limits which you have already in private consultation with me expressed your willingness to observe. But as Bishop of the diocese I cannot be present at any service where incense is ceremoniously used, or visit any Church in which the limits already referred to with regard to the reservation of the Holy Sacrament are transgressed."

I understand something of the difficulties that may be felt by the Bishop in these matters, but it appears to me, having regard to the general scope of these practices, and above all to the support which lies behind them as indicated in the utterances of Lord Halifax and certain representative clergy, it is clearly shown that it is the duty of the Bishop to take a firm stand in dealing with these matters, and if after four years it is found that they have not been able to bring these matters into line, am I asking too much if I ask the House to take the responsibility of this matter, and to proceed to redeem the promises given on the 10th May, 1899?

I should like to say just one word about the churches in which these practices exist. I hold in my hand a list of seventy-one churches in the dioceses of London, St. Albans, Oxford, Ripon, Chichester, Canterbury, Exeter, Bristol, Llandaff and Rochester in which the following practices, or some of them, are prevalent, and I want to show to this House that this matter is not confined to a single diocese, but is spread all over the country. It is not a question of one diocese but of many dioceses, and it is clear that nothing but concerted action on the part of the Bishops, which has not been so far forthcoming, can possibly be effective. It is also clear that some action in this House is imperatively required to enforce such action on the part of the Bishops. I find that in these seventy-one churches —I do not want to go much into details —the following practices are prevalent: the celebration of Children's Eucharists; the reservation of the Sacrament, with visits for the purpose of devotions and adorations; the use of an illegal ritual approximating more or less closely to that of the Roman Catholic Mass; the inculcation of habitual confession to a priest; the celebration of unauthorised festivals; the celebration of Requiem Masses; the invocation of Saints; devotions to the Virgin; the inculcation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception; and the use of devotions from the Roman "Ordinary of the Mass," and of secret prayers from the Roman "Canon of the Mass." I think this House will readily admit that these practices have no place in the National Reformed Church of this country as by law established. We may well ask ourselves what the position is of that discipline under which practices of this character have grown to such an alarming extent. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is not out of place to enquire what the Archbishops and the Bishops have been doing during the last four years since the Government passed the Amendment to which I referred in the opening of my speech—what they have been doing during those four years of grace which they have had from this House—what they have been doing, that in so large a number of churches there still exists in unblushing fashion practices distinctly adverse and opposed to the reformed character of the National Church.

I should like for one moment, and I will not detain the House longer on this point—but I would like to refer to the extraordinary service held at St. John's Church, Plymouth, quite recently. The writer of the description which I hold in my hand, who was present, says it was difficult to describe the service, for in its details it was absolutely alien to the Church of England. He had attended many services in various parts of the country, but he had never known one where the Prayer-book was so entirely ignored as at St. John's. At this Requiem Mass the service was practically identical with that provided in the Roman Missal. Secret prayers took the place of that noble ceremonial which was familiar to the adherents of the National Church of this country, and, when the time came for the performance of the most sacred rite of the Christian religion, the only communicant was a lad of ten or twelve years, who was communicated with a wafer only, the cup being denied.

I think the fact that services of that kind are possible in the Church of England to-day is a reproach to the Episcopal Bench of this country. Next I would like, in respect to these seventy-one churches, to call the attention of the House to the extraordinary fact—a fact most significant, I think—that seventeen of these churches are in the gift of Keble College. I am going, if I may, to read out a list of the Members of the Council of the College, which, I think, should have some interest for this House. I find on that Council the Earl of Cranbrook, the Rev. P. G. Medd, Lord Aldenham, the Bishop of Lincoln, the Hon. W. E. Sackville-West, the Bishop of Rochester, the Rev. F. V. Spurling, Lord Hugh Cecil, Sir John Riddell, Mr. J. G. Talbot, M.P., Dr. Moberley, Canon Newbolt and Lord Halifax. I do not think it is necessary for me to illustrate to the House the significance of this College and its patronage. Here you have two Bishops of the Established Church of this country, pledged, and most solemnly pledged, to put down these illegal practices, contrary as they are both to the spirit and letter of the Prayer-book, pledged to put them down, and having failed in putting them down, they still remain members of the Council of the College which is responsible for some of the most extreme churches ever known in this country. I do trust that the House will recognise the significance of the settled policy of this College. This is not the mere case of an isolated church, or of a capricious incumbent. Here you have a College—an ancient College—[Cries of "No, no!"] Well, put it then a modern College, presumed to be founded for the advancement of the Christian religion—more particularly in that branch of it, the Reformed Church of this country. Here you have had two bishops on this Council, lending itself to these extreme practices year after year. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most deplorable illustrations we have of the state of things in our Church—that these two bishops should still remain on the Council of this college.

I do not want to go further into details in respect to these churches, but I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that a notice will appear shortly, or has appeared, that on the 6th May a notable service will be held at St. Paul's Cathedral. By permission of the Dean, the Army Guild will have a celebration of Holy Communion for the repose of the soldiers who died in the South African War. The principal feature will be the ancient Roman prayer for the dead, "Rest and peace, eternal Lord, in mercy give to them; let light perpetual lighten them," which will be sung twice during the service. Such a service has not been held in the Cathedral since the Reformation. I do not know how this House regards these ancient ecclesiastical fabrics. For my part I look upon them as fabrics hallowed by a thousand associations, intertwined with the hearts of Englishmen—as fabrics in regard to which I have a right to say something as to the services to be held there; and I must say, for my part, that it is with feelings of indignation that I regard the action of the dignitaries who have the control of these noble fabrics, who, without consulting the general wishes of the community, and apparently without recognising the obligations of the Prayer-book, are prepared to throw over the Reformed Church in practice as well as in theory. I should think they may well, Mr. Speaker, be called to account by this House for the manner in which they are discharging their great trust.

The Bill which has been introduced, and of which I now move the Second Reading, is very short, and it is, I think, a very simple measure. Of course there are alternative proposals. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich (Lord Hugh Cecil) has, I believe, certain proposals of his own which are not before this House. He went down recently to the Canterbury House of Laymen with these proposals in his pocket, and he took up an attitude which, to my mind, was hardly to be expected from his well-known amiability, an attitude almost of ferocity towards a body of Christian laymen who really did not deserve the treatment he gave them. The noble Lord went down with his proposals to that House of Laymen, and practically told them that their choice lay between his Bill and the continuance of the present anarchy in the Church, or disruption, and he added these momentous words, and one can imagine the terror which must have run through the Canterbury House of Laymen when they heard their doom from the lips of the noble Lord:—

> "In fact," he said, "your choice is the choice of Hobson."

I think this reference to Hobson was infelicitous, because Hobson, I need not remind the House, was an innkeeper who appears to have offered his guests the choice of the horse nearest the door or none at all. Unfortunately for the noble Lord his horse, if I may use the metaphor, is nowhere near the door; it has been jostled into the back part of the stable, and is therefore not before the House. If I may follow up the metaphor, I may say that if there is an animal ready saddled and bridled, ready to be mounted by some able equestrian, say, like the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury, it is the Bill of which I have the pleasure of moving the Second Reading to-day. But there are other proposals besides that, even, of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich. These proposals are those of my hon. and learned friend the Member for the Stretford Division (Mr. C. A. Cripps), who has embodied his ideals in a Bill which has been printed and circulated in this House. I want to put very briefly before the House, and very clearly, the nature of the Bill we have submitted, and the nature of certain counter proposals, though, of course, possibly the rules of debate will not allow me to go into them with very much detail.

As regards the measure we have introduced, it is a Bill to take advantage of the existing Courts and procedure, and is not in any sense an attempt to make a revolutionary change in the courts or the general ecclesiastical system of the Church of England. One of the main proposals of the Bill is to do away with the unpleasant provision by which a clergyman of a contumacious character—and such are unfortunately found occasionally in the Church of England—is obliged to go to gaol until he has purged his contempt of Court, and to substitute the more reasonable penalty of deprivation from his benefice.

The other main provision of the Bill is the abolition of the veto of the Bishops, a veto which I think it will be generally admitted does effectually debar the laity of the Church of England, who are entitled to have in their parish churches the services prescribed by law, from seeking redress in the Courts of law. I am well aware that on this question of the veto considerable difference of opinion is bound to arise, but I wish to put before the House the unique hardship of the laity of the Established Church. The laity have no representation whatever in any Church Synod, nor have they any voice whatever as to the nature of the services they have to attend, and I submit that it is an intolerable hardship that during the last fifty years a complete revolution in the services of the National Church should in many cases have taken place, a revolution which is utterly repugnant to many of those who attend the church, which has driven the people from the parish church to seek the worship of God elsewhere, and which, if a referendum to the laity had been at any time possible, would have been instantly prohibited by the common sense and judgment of the country. Although the "freehold" of the clergyman—for which, as the son of a clergyman, I have the greatest possible respect—is an institution of great value, yet I am bound to say that it has been remorsely and capriciously abused in many cases, to the great and sore grievance of adherents of the Church. Even though this sacerdotalism has been so long at work in the Church my solemn believe is, that if to-day you consulted the adult male attendants in the parish churches throughout the country, if you could form them into a kind of Lay Synod for the purposes of a referendum on this matter, by an overwhelming majority they would declare against these practices, and manifest their adherence to the Reformed Episcopal Church.

It may be said that there is the law to look to. That is just the point of the Bill before us. The Episcopal veto has prevented, does prevent, and in my judgment will prevent, those who are aggrieved by these practices seeking legitimate redress in the Courts of law. There is a difference of opinion here. The Episcopal authorities of the Church tell us that the veto has not been exercised because no one has desired to put the law in motion; on the other hand, there are gentlemen who tell us that the veto must not be taken away, because, if it were, every one would desire to put the law in motion. Notwithstanding his explanation the other day, I think the

Archbishop's judgment was perfectly correct when he said that the knowledge that this veto exists has prevented and does prevent the aggrieved laity betaking themselves to the only tribunal where they have any chance of redress, viz., the ecclesiastical Courts of the country. It may and probably will be urged in this debate that if we take away the veto of the Bishop prosecutions will mutiply all over the country. I wish to say, as far as I am concerned, that I believe the idea of an infinite number of prosecutions of clergymen by the laity is the merest bogey, and may be dismissed as such. There is in a layman a natural reluctance to come into collision with his clergyman which does him infinite credit. The fact of the matter is that, so far from desiring to prosecute, those who are offended by these practices retire from the Church, and leave the clergyman in possession of the field, to bring up according to his own ideas, the younger generation, whom he has captured by methods to which I do not care more particularly to allude. I do submit that it is a reasonable proposition that if anything effective is to be done to check these practices, you must put into the hands of those aggrieved by them the right of appealing to the ecclesiastical Courts of the country. I may say with regard to the Act of 1840, which is touched by this Bill, we have been careful to preserve the position of the Bishop, by which a *primâ facie* case, or the contrary, is ascertained, so that, as far as I can see, there is no risk under our Bill of a clergyman being exposed to a frivolous or vexatious suit. In addition, we have put into the Act, for the first time, security for costs. In the Act of 1874, where the veto is abolished, there already exists security for costs. To my mind that is a solid and sufficient guarantee that frivolous and vexatious suits will not be brought.

I wish to refer for one moment to the proposals of my hon. and learned friend the Member for the Stretford Division. The fundamental basis of our Bill is an affirmation, which we ask this House to make, of the right of the laity to have, in their parish churches, services in conformity with the law—not a dull, rigid, and mechanical uniformity, such as we are sometimes charged with seeking, but one in accordance with the elastic limits of that most elastic of books– the Prayer-book of the Church of England. All we desire is that there should be some finality to this process which is going on in the Established Church, and that those who are aggrieved should have the right of redress, which has been denied them by the exercise of the Episcopal veto for many, many years. The proposals of my hon. and learned friend do not appear to me to deal with that point in any shape or way. He has been careful not only to preserve the veto, but, if possible, to increase the discretion of the Bishop, and the curious thing is that, according to his proposals, when once the complainant who, I suppose is the layman, has set the machinery in motion, he disappears altogether ; for that matter, he apparently has nothing more to do with the process of law. The whole thing is a matter of ecclesiastical administration within the folds of the Established Church between the Bishop and the clergyman. I do not so read the position of the laity of the Established Church. I think their position is something different from that. They have a right to be considered, and I cannot accept the proposals of my hon. and learned friend as in any sense a vindication of their position, or as redressing the burning grievance under which they have been suffering.

One more point, and one of vital importance, viz., that of the appeal to the Crown as the ultimate authority of justice in matters ecclesiastical as well as civil. The proposals of my hon. and learned friend, as I read them, amount to this—that unless the clergyman complained of elects to proceed under the Act of 1840, the whole procedure of his suggested machinery is confined to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church, and no appeal lies to the Crown in any shape or form. I am not one of those who desire to see the disestablishment of the Church of England. I desire to see that connection on certain terms maintained and strengthened, but I do not think the way to maintain and cherish that connection is to put into the hands of the Archbishops of the Church the absolute unfettered right of declaring what is or what is not the legal doctrine and ritual of the national Church. You could not maintain an Established Church in this country on those terms. I submit that though the State has not claimed, and does not claim, the right to decree the doctrine of the Church, on the other hand, it is not open to the Established Church of this country to alter her doctrine and ritual without consultation with the State, of which she is a member. That is the constitutional position, because this House will remember that when the present Prayer-book was passed by Convocation it was submitted to the House, and although this House did refrain from making any change in that Prayer-book, it distinctly asserted its right to do so if it thought fit. These are the two grounds on which I object to the proposals of my hon. and learned friend, and the reasons for which I prefer the proposals embodied in the Bill, the Second Reading of which I am now moving. To maintain the royal supremacy is surely part and parcel of any establishment of this kind.

Before I sit down—and I fear I have been far too long, but the subject is of immense importance—I desire to say one word in conclusion upon the general position of affairs in the Church of England. A very great statesman in this House once said he did not know how to draw an indictment against the whole nation. I, and those who act with me in this matter, do not know how to draw an indictment against the whole of the clergy of this country, but we do feel that the due limits of elasticity have long been exceeded, and that it is imperative that this House should take definite and deliberate action to effectively redress these grievances, and to make known to the Episcopal Bench our determinato put a period to these practices. I hope it is with moderation that I have put my case before the House, but though I have stated my case with moderation, I think it should be understood that behind that moderation there are the accents of inflexible resolution, not only on my part, because, after all, I am only an insignificant Member of this House, but on the part of the great Protestant forces of this country, who are determined that a period shall be put to this Romanising of the national Church. In the hope that this House will pay attention to that resolution, and pay attention to the very moderate proposals embodied in this Bill, I now beg to move the Second Reading of this Measure.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

* MR. C. A. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford): I am sure the hon. Member who has moved this Bill has put forward the views, which we know he feels so strongly on Church matters, in a moderate form, and I think he will find in what I have to say as regards this question that I agree with him that it must be dealt with, and I think it ought no longer to be postponed. That is my view as regards this great issue, and I think when he hears my view he will appreciate that he has misunderstood the remedies which I propose, and I yet hope that, as between his views and mine, there may be sufficient ground for conciliation, in order that this great question may be settled without reference to any particular Party, and with credit to our great national Church as a whole. I agree, of course, with much that he said in the first part of his speech. I should have been the last person to have introduced into this House a Bill upon this difficult and complicated question of Church discipline without I had been absolutely convinced—as much so as the hon. Member for Liverpool—that it is necessary to have better discipline in the Church of England, and that we must put an end to these eccentric and extravagant practices which as a Churchman I dislike, and which, in my view, form a serious obstacle to the future development of our national Church. On those grounds it cannot be necessary for me either to follow the hon. Member or to join issue as to the necessity of a Church Discipline Bill at the present time.

I should like to say, and probably it is on this point that we differ, that I do not think that the allegations which he has made apply at large to the clergy of the Church of England. I believe they are hard-working, self-sacrificing members of the community, who give up their lives to the Church in which they believe, and do this with energy and power and religious spirit, more particularly in some of our poorest and most crowded towns. In fact, I would go so far as to say that but for the power and popularity of the Church of England as a living spiritual organisation making itself felt in the national life, and the national aspirations of this country, we as a great people might sink to the lowest level of materialism, with, in my view, a most certain decadence in the future. I feel the responsibility as much as my hon. friend, and nothing should I regret more if, perchance, in the course of this debate I used any expression which could emphasise differences of opinion, my whole desire being harmonious action in order to bring a great evil to a satisfactory reform. My hon. friend's remedy is to take away power and responsibility from the Bishops, but my remedy, as I shall point out when I come to matters of detail, is to make that responsibility greater, and at the same time to give an effective means by which that responsibility may be utilised for the good discipline of the national Church. There, of course, is a fundamental difference between us. But let me add this. To suggest that I am wanting to interfere with the Royal supremacy, or that the proposals contained in my Bill in any way affect the power of the Privy Council as a supreme court on matters of doctrine, can only be stated because my hon. friend cannot possibly have appreciated what are the true proposals of the Bill for which I am responsible. That Bill, if I may say so at this moment, is not to supersede the Privy Council, but it is by a certain procedure to make it more easy that there may be an effective appeal to the Supreme Court of this realm on matters of doctrine and ritual.

And as regards the question of the Bishops, I do not know what the hon. Member means when he speaks, I think, of revolutionary proposals. Is he aware that at the present moment under similar provisions in the Act of 1840, and in the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874, there is recognition of this principle, that, if possible, these matters, instead of being referred with all the evils of litigation, the costly and cumbrous procedure of litigation to our courts, may be settled, where they ought to be settled, by friendly relationship between the Bishop on the one side and the clergy on the other. I am introducing no new principle at all; I am only trying to make effective a principle which ought to go to the whole root of the discipline of our National Church. What we complain of now—we who want discipline and who want reform—is that the Bishop has no effective power in order to make his views supreme where, under the constitution of this country, these matters are referred to him for his decision. I only ask in the Bill that I propose that an effective power shall be given, and if that effective power is not used, then, and then only, will be the time to issue these general indictments against the fabric of our Church and against its constitution.

Now, Sir, without raising points of difference between the hon. Member for Liverpool and myself, let me state to the House what appeared to me to be the purport of his speech, and let me also state, at any rate, that in my opinion he showed no case whatever for the particular proposal which he has brought forward in his own Bill. He told us at the outset—and there I agree with what he says—that many evils of the Church arise not from the want of the Bishops to intervene, but from the want of effective powers of intervention. I want to know what effective power of intervention is given by a Bill which does not deal with any of the true difficulties, and they are great, of Church procedure, but which proposes to take away all the responsibility which now rests upon the Bishop, and to free them from the duties to which they are bound as Bishops of our Church, and from the imposition of punishments which they ought to impose upon clergy who will not obey the directions which their ecclesiastical superiors have a right to give. Let me say this other word of criticism as regards the speech of my hon. friend. I was waiting throughout that speech for him to give me some illustration that the difficulties with which our Church is encompassed were in any way due to the use of that veto power by the Bishops. Now, I appeal to this House whether from beginning to end he gave one single illustration to show that the Bishops had ever interposed the veto in order to prevent the duties of the Church being carried on in a constitutional way. I do not ask him, of course, to refer to what was said by the Archbishop the other day, but I think he might have this in mind. He might have dealt with an allegation which he knows to have been made—that for thirty years, except in two notorious cases, one in Gloucestershire and the other in Rochester, the veto of the Bishop has never been exercised in order to screen illegality on the part of clergymen of the Church in this country. I speak, perhaps, with some warmth on this point. I do not quite take the same view of the veto as some of my hon. friends do. I will say by-and-bye why I think that the veto ought not to be interfered with, but I have stated in public constantly, and in the discharge of my duties, that if it can be shown that the veto of the Bishops had not been used for its legitimate purpose, but used with the object of screening illegality, I should say for my part it would be necessary to make some change in the constitution of our Church. But there is no evidence that we have come to any such crisis in the constitution of our Church; and may I say this further, which I think will impress the House, and certainly carries my view in the direction I have always held, that not only has the hon. Member not given one single illustration of the abuse of the veto, but there was a document issued this morning, coming I believe from the same source as the Bill itself, which shows conclusively that in the opinion of that body, with which this Bill is closely associated, the difficulties of Church discipline arise entirely on other grounds, and not from the abuse of the veto at all, and surely, if I am right in that, what can be more futile or ineffective than this Bill? Are we sitting here as a House of Commons, anxiously desirous, as the hon. Member says, to bring about a better state of Church discipline? Are we to be called upon to deal with an evil that does not exist to attempt to reform Church discipline on lines which in my opinion are absolutely childlike so far as they affect the future? Let me point out what was said in the document issued this morning, and which I presume was sent to various Members of the House. It deals with what is called the Archbishops' reply to the hon. Member who represents the Tewkesbury Division. What does this document say? I ask the attention of the House to this point. It does not suggest from beginning to end—it could hardly suggest after what was said by the Archbishop—that either the want of Church discipline is due to the existence of the veto, or that the veto of either the Bishop or Archbishop has ever been improperly imposed. Just let me read this. It says—

> "The real reason why prosecutions ceased to be taken was that the judges in the ecclesiastical Courts refused to deprive the clerical lawbreaker even after repeated convictions."

That refers to the Maconochie case. It has nothing whatever to do with the matter. Whether you have the veto or not in this respect it would make no difference. The same difficulties have existed since the 1840 and 1874 Acts. They have applied to cases of actual prosecutions as much as to the cases where prosecutions have not been carried further in the courts of justice, and where, as I shall point out, in a moment, as regards the proposals I think ought to be adopted, we should have some effective methods of applying procedure in order to produce discipline in the national Church. So far as these proposals are concerned, which are introduced by the Member for one of the divisions of Liverpool, they do not in any way touch the real difficulty or bring about such a simplification of procedure as would enable us to have a better system of discipline in our Church. Let me refer to one other passage which appears to me to be rather peculiar. It says—

> "For many years the Church Association has brought forward Bills having for their object the substitution of deprivation for imprisonment, and until this has been effected, we decided to hold our hand."

I hope the House will realise, first of all, that for a long series of years—no one knows it better than the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire—it has been possible to have deprivation without any appeal whatever to this system of imprisonment. Let me make this further answer to the Church Association. If you have imprisonment at all—which I admit I object to totally, and which I think ought to have no place whatever in our ecclesiastical procedure—if you have it at all it can only be imposed at the option of the prosecution. Are we to believe that the Church Association has held its hand on this ground, although as all ecclesiastical lawyers know, it has long been held; that in order to get obedience to our ecclesiastical courts and monitions, the Privy Council has established that deprivation may take the place of imprisonment? Does my hon. friend agree that these are the two difficulties:—one on the question as regards possible imprisonment, and the other as regards procedure apart from veto? I am only dealing with what is the statement of the Church Association. If he agrees that these are the two difficulties, I beg him to reconsider the position, and to consider that we must have some effective measure of Church discipline.

Before I come to deal closely with the Bill connected with my name, let me say one or two words on the general question. I am not one of those who are alarmed at what are called crises in our Church history. You must have crises, and I think we must all realise that times of crises are nearly always times of religious revival. We do not want the kind of apathy that characterised part of the eighteenth century. I suppose my hon. friend, if he had lived in the latter part of that century, would have been issuing his monitions against the evangelical revival which marked the later years of the eighteenth century. Can anything really be worse than for extreme parties in the Church to be seeking by some cast-iron system of litigation to suppress all those from whom they differ in these periods of ecclesiastical revival? The ideal of the national Church is a very high one. It is difficult, of course, to reconcile doctrine and authority. They have in the Church of Rome eliminated private opinion, which is the heritage of our Nonconformist bodies. The ideal of the national Church has been to reconcile these two great conflicting views, which at times of course must come into contact—authority on the one side and liberty on the other—authority within the constitution of the Church and liberty within the constitution of the Church, and unless you combine these two elements you will not attract Churchmen on the one side or a living spiritual organisation on the other. I do not agree with what the hon. Member said as to the probability of prosecutions. Of course, so far as the hon. Member is concerned, I appreciate what he said without taking his view of the case. There are rich organisations and rich individuals. What security is given by mere costs in such a case as that? Why should anyone who, perhaps, in the country has a harvest thanksgiving service, why should any one who may have deviated from the lines of the Act of Uniformity, be liable at the instance of any common informer behind whom there is sufficient wealth to interfere with the life and liberty of our hard working clergymen of the Church of England? For my own part I can never accede to such a proposition.

Now let me sketch in a few words, because I cannot go into the matter in detail, how I think the question of Church discipline might be approached, in order that on a basis of conciliation moderate and other Churchmen may get rid of this difficulty, and that we may have a proper and successful scheme of Church discipline — not cast-iron limits of discipline—which would keep each Churchman within the constitution, and yet give sufficient liberty for national life and aspiration. Under existing conditions there are two lines on which clergymen can be proceeded against on questions of heresy and doctrine. They are established by the well known Acts of 1840 and 1874. What do these two Acts establish? There is nothing in the proposals I make which goes outside the principles of those Acts. As regards the Act of 1840 there are two forms of procedure. You can go through Commissions of Bishops Courts, the Court of Arches, and possibly after an enormous expenditure, of no use and not productive, you may find yourself under the protective *aegis* of the Privy Council.

I think the first and necessary step to be taken as regards the reform of the discipline of the Church of England is to simplify procedure and bring it up to modern date so that it shall not involve undue complication or undue cost, and so that anyone who wishes to make a complaint against any clergyman of the Church of England shall have an easy and effective remedy before a properly constituted and modernised tribunal. I ask my hon. friend, who, as I understand, is opposed to the principle of the Bill I am introducing, I ask any hon. Member on the opposite side of the House, as well as on this, who is sincerely desirous of reform in the direction of Church discipline, whether he would not agree with me that one of the most necessary steps is the simplification of procedure in order that measures can be taken without undue delay to bring an appeal to the tribunal of the Privy Council. This is a part of the proposal in the Bill with which my name is associated. I can assure hon. Gentlemen that any one who had studied it would not for one moment say that it interferes with the principle of the Royal supremacy. I know there has been some misapprehension on this point, to judge from a circular which has been sent round to hon. Members by some Association. The Royal supremacy is not mentioned in my Bill; the Royal supremacy is not touched in my Bill. It would remain the same if that Bill were passed as it is at the present moment. On that point, of course, I do not agree with all my hon. friends, and probably not with the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, but standing here, as one who has had great experience in ecclesiastical matters, I declare that I would never willingly myself take any step which would interfere with the rights of the laity of this country in regard to the Royal supremacy in ecclesiastical matters. I am one of those who believe that the laity have their rights in our great national Church; and that they ought to have an effective means of establishing their due constitutional rights in our great national Church; and the consolation, to my mind, of discussions of this kind in the House of Commons is, that it shows that the laity of the country feel their responsibility as active members of our national Church. I desire that their views should be expressed in this great assembly, or wherever the laity are represented, on all questions of ecclesiastical discipline.

There is the other side as regards the form of Church discipline. At the present moment, even under the Act of 1840 and the Act of 1874, by consent of the parties you can go to the Bishop, and his decision is absolute. I cannot understand any one who has any knowledge of these Ecclesiastical Acts venturing to assert for one moment that that principle of consent in matters of Ecclesiastical procedure has any bearing whatever on the question of the Royal supremacy. Does my hon. friend suppose that those who framed the Acts of 1840 and 1874 had any such opinion in their minds. All I propose is this—and I hope it will be a most effective form of procedure in the future—naturally enough, and I think no one would recognise that more than the hon. Member—where a Bishop is in the position of the promoter of a suit, a particular clergyman may not be willing, even by consent, to have his case decided by a Bishop who is at once prosecutor and judge—is that in order that all parties may have a tribunal in which they have confidence—the Bishops and the Archbishops on the one side, and the clergyman, who on his ordination has sworn obedience, on the other—to give an appeal even in consent matters brought before the Bishop, which does not exist at the present moment, either to the Archbishops or the Archbishop's Court in order to make the action of the Bishop, by consent of the parties interested or affected, a successful disciplinary measure, and so that he may be enabled to force the clergyman to carry out his order. But the proposal now before the House destroys, no doubt, the responsibility of the Bishop, and destroys one of the fundamental principles of our Church as laid down by Lord Stowell and recognised by the great evangelical Lord Chancellor, Lord Cairns, and although I can conceive conditions under which the safeguard of the veto might be taken away, yet, if we take the revolutionary procedure of altering the Constitution of the Church, I can see that such an alteration goes so far to the foundation of our whole national Church institution, that, if the House presses on a reform on those lines, one half the Church of England would feel that the fundamental principles on which they had joined that Church had been contravened. It is not necessary to have such a fundamental alteration.

Now, if we really desire the effective intervention of the Privy Council, let us have a proper reform of procedure. If we really desire that the interposition of the Bishop should be effective, where consent is given, let us give due power to the interposition of the Bishop. I want on this matter to declare myself as clearly as I can. I am as earnestly anxious as the hon. Member for Liverpool for a reform of the Church procedure, in order that discipline may be effectively and properly carried out. I do not want, and probably nobody wants, anything in the nature of petty persecution. Much as I dislike many matters which may go on in the Church I recognise that within the limits of the law every member of that great national institution has the same right as I have to his own individual opinion. Nothing could be worse than to curtail the charity and comprehension of our great national Church. What would be a greater misfortune than if we reduced the Church of the nation to the Church of a sect? I think I am bound to say that this Bill, introduced as it is, is in its nature, and must be, a partisan Bill which the Church at large can never accept in the full spirit in which my hon. friend has brought it forward. I hope that my intervention in this debate may possibly lead to some effective steps being taken as regards the future. I should not object to the Second Reading of the Bill of the hon. Member for Liverpool if that could be done, without the opinion of those in this House who do not agree with him, being in any way committed to it. I should like both these Bills to be read a second time, and to be sent to some strong and impartial Committee in order that the desire of both my hon. friend and myself may be satisfied, and that these evils in the Church may be remedied on broad and comprehensive grounds. But in making that statement, I must also say that if this one Bill is pressed forward—which I look on as the Bill of a Party, as a Bill which the Church at large can never accept, and which the Church at large ought never to accept—I shall have to vote against it, not in any obstructive sense, but in order that if not now, on some future occasion our great national Church, used as authority on the one side and due liberty and freedom on the other, may be reformed in matters of discipline on broad and comprehensive lines acceptable to the Church as a whole, and not put forward by one Party only.

*MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.): My hon. and learned friend has announced himself as a Church reformer; but in sitting down he intimated that he would vote against this Bill, because the Bill as it stands ought not to be accepted, and he told us it never would be accepted, by the Church of England. If the House were to agree to the proposal of the hon. and learned Gentleman to refer both these measures to a Committee, the *status quo* of anarchy, which is acknowledged to be at this moment the condition of the Church of England, would be indefinitely protracted. My hon. and learned friend tells us that he is anxious for reform, but his Bill is a Bill the only effect of which will be to postpone indefinitely any action that can be taken. He told us that he intended to leave the Bishops with their present powers unaffected; so that my hon. and learned friend, so far from being a reformer, leaves the Bishops free to act precisely as they have done for the last sixty years, and, if his Bill is carried, as they would continue to do for the next sixty years. But my hon. and learned friend is a lawyer, and I am astonished how any gentleman of legal acquirements can seriously contend that his measure does not impeach the Royal supremacy in the Church of England. A suit may be instituted before a Bishop, and, in the ordinary course, it ends there, subject to an appeal to the Archbishop, if the clergymen does not elect to have the matter determined under the provisions of the Clergy Discipline Act, 1840. It is only if the clergyman elects that there is an appeal to the King in Council. No such election is given to the laity. My hon. and learned friend would therefore in these suits restrict the supremacy of the King in Council, and would impose a direct limitation of that supremacy in Church and State.

Let me try to indicate the position. If a clergyman elects, the suit may be conducted under the provisions of the existing law, and an appeal to the Privy Council would arise in the ordinary course. But no one in his senses ever supposes that a clergyman would elect to carry litigation into the ordinary courts so as to allow an appeal to the King in Council, because it is the arbitrament of the King in Council against which the clergy are protesting. Therefore, in every case, except in an infinitesimal number of suits, you will have, under this specious proposal for facilitating the application of a remedy to check the present evils in the Church, the whole litigation with regard to doctrine and ritual in the Church finally determined without any appeal to the King in Council. My hon. and learned friend protests his zeal for the Royal supremacy, and for the Church as established by law in this country. How can he consistently advocate such a measure, and yet ask the House to regard him as loyal to the Royal supremacy.

Lord HUGH CECIL: May I ask the hon. and learned Gentleman whether he thinks the Royal supremacy exists in regard to the Established Church of Scotland or not?

*Mr. LAWSON WALTON: The noble Lord must excuse me for not dealing with the Church of Scotland just now.

Mr. CRIPPS: May there not be a final determination by the Bishop under the existing law if the parties consent?

*Mr. LAWSON WALTON: If the parties consent to give the Bishop the final power of determining the question the Bishop has that power, but it is not derived under statute, but by consent. Apart from the consent of the parties there is an appeal first from the Diocesan Court to the Arches Court, and then from the Arches Court to the King in Council. That, I take it, is part of the constitution of the Church of England, and as part of the constitution of the Church of England it forms part of the constitution of this country, which maintains that the Royal supremacy exists over matters ecclesiastical as well as civil. This principle would be seriously impaired if the House were to adopt the proposal of my hon. and learned friend. Let me for a moment challenge another branch of my hon. and learned friend's argument. What is the question with which we have to deal? The question is not a theological question; it is not a question of Church policy; it is not a question as to whether it is desirable that different schools of opinion should be allowed to exist within the limits of the Established Church. The question for this House is whether the law is or is not to be enforced; whether a condition of anarchy is to be allowed to prevail in the Church, Has not the House a duty in regard to that matter, by taking such prompt and efficient measures as will satisfy public opinion and restore order in the Church?

My hon. and learned friend dealt with the present state of things, and he challenged, what I thought was clearly demonstrated by the hon. Member who introduced the Bill, namely, the statement that the cause of the present condition of things is the attitude which the Bishops have taken up for twenty-five years in regard to litigation in Church courts. Does my hon. and learned friend deny that from 1879, when the Bishop of Oxford refused to allow a suit to be instituted against a clergyman, there has been a consistent policy on the part of the Episcopal Bench to discourage all litigation as regards doctrine or ritual in the courts. My hon. and learned friend says that he defies any one to mention a case in which a Bishop has exercised his veto as regards a suit which ought to have been allowed to be brought. In the case in which the Bishop of Oxford exercised his veto, the clergyman concerned admitted that on six points, all of great consequence, he had been guilty of infraction of the law; and the ground on which that suit was not allowed to be instituted was that the prevalence of these suits injured the Church, that the remedy was worse than the disease, and that the revival of mediæval ritual and teaching was less harmful than litigation to check it. That action on the part of the Bishop of Oxford was applauded by the Prelates of the period, and has been the consistent policy of the Episcopal Bench from that time down to the present. Yet my hon.

and learned friend says that in every proper case the Bishops have been prepared to allow a suit to be brought. The Primate the other day told a deputation that there were only two or three recorded cases of the veto being exercised by living Members of the Bench. But the right rev. Prelate forgot that it is the duty of the Bishops to put the law in motion. He entirely forgot that under the Act of 1840, and under the Act of 1874, the Bishops are empowered to take the necessary legal steps to stop the spread of these evils; and while the laity have a right to resort to the courts, it is clearly the duty of a Bishop on his own mere motion to put the law in force; and in every proper case he ought to put the law in force in order to check these evils. Can my hon. and learned friend point to a single case where for twenty-five years a Bishop has put the law in motion to check the prevalence of illegality in ritual or doctrine? My hon. and learned friend says that the veto has not been placed to any great extent on the suits of the laity; but the best answer to that statement is that no suit on the motion of a Bishop has ever been brought.

As far as the inaction of the laity is concerned, it can be easily explained. In the first place, enormous sums of money were spent in contesting the claim of the Bishop of Oxford to prohibit the institution of the suit to which I have referred, and after the House of Lords had declared that members of the Episcopal Bench had an absolute discretion, the law was clear, and it was hardly desirable for the laity to bring forward suits without the consent of the Bishop. In these circumstances, it is easily understood why so very few suits were brought. By the litigation which took place between 1874 and 1879, disputed questions of ritual were settled, the ordinances of the Church were judicially defined, and it was then for the Bishops to enforce the law; and, therefore, naturally members of the Evangelical party held aloof because the Bishops were anxious themselves to be entrusted with the power to put down these evils. The law having been made quite clear by the suits promoted by an association of laymen, the Episcopal Bench has had for twenty-five years unfettered freedom to use their own administrative powers in regard to this matter. What is the result? The result is a state of chaos. What is the remedy? The remedy, and the only remedy, is that proposed by this Bill. The remedy is that we must abolish the Episcopal veto, with a check to prevent the institution of suits by irresponsible persons in frivolous or vexatious cases. This Bill will in the main accomplish both these objects. In the first place, it will abolish the veto, and allow the Courts to be open to the laity; and in the second place, it provides that the persons who seek to put the law in motion shall be responsible persons, and that they shall provide the cost of the litigation. An Amendment might easily be introduced in Committee that power be given to strike out any vexatious or frivolous case. That power exists in the High Court to-day. A person who prefers a vexatious claim will find that claim struck out without any preliminary trial. That power, coupled with the full security as to costs, should be a sufficient protection. It follows that the layman who seeks to use the law must be a responsible person; and the case must be one of gravity. What are the objections? My hon. and learned friend says that the Bill would impair the Episcopal authority of the bishops and would diminish the dignity and influence of their office; but Lord Stowell declared that the right of the bishops to prevent the laity using the courts had never in ancient times been asserted, and Dr. Lushington agreed with him; Lord Chief Justice Cockburn held that it did not exist; and, indeed, there is no ground for supposing that until 1879 the bishops ever sought to prevent the laity using the Courts of the Church in circumstances in which, according to their view the law had been broken, and for securing the remedy which the law provided. I would also ask my hon. and learned friend why should the Bishop have the right to control litigation in the Courts of the Church Is the Bishop to be the prosecutor? My hon. and learned friend's Bill will make him the prosecutor.

Mr. C. A. CRIPPS: If my hon. and learned friend had read the Bill he would see that it provides exactly the contrary.

*Mr. LAWSON WALTON: The Bill provides that the Bishop shall issue an admonition, and if it is disregarded, the Bishop shall then authorise a suit to be brought; and, directly or indirectly, he becomes the prosecutor of his own clergy. If I were arguing the question on *à priori* grounds I think I could demonstrate to the House that nothing is more calculated to detract from the influence of a Bishop than that he should be thrown into collision with his own clergy. Surely, if a proper case is brought forward, if it is held not to be frivolous or vexatious, if it be preferred by responsible persons who give security to indemnify the person against whom the suit is brought, the dignified course for the Bishop would be to retire from the dispute, and say that as his episcopal efforts had failed to bring about peace, let litigation proceed and let the law be established. The greatest authorities have approved of the abolition of the veto. The late Lord Coleridge declared that the bishops had undoubtedly abused their trust in regard to this matter; that in preventing all litigation they were acting outside their province, and that the discretion given to them in the Act of 1840 was to stop improper suits and improper suits only, Lord Coleridge came to the conclusion that the concerted action of the bishops in discouraging all litigation in regard to Church matters amounted to an abuse of the discretionary powers conferred upon them by Statute. What are the consequences? Why at the present time these suits do not exist? My hon. and learned friend the Member for Stretford is also in opposition to Lord Penzance on this point; while Lord Cairns pointed out that the absence of the power under the existing law for securing costs was a ground for inferring that, under the existing law, the right of veto existed. The Bill removes this support from an authority much relied upon by the opponents of the measure. I ask the House, supposing this Bill were passed tomorrow, what possible harm would be done to anybody? A layman may sue in every Court of the realm except the Ecclesiastical Courts without consulting anybody. Why is the Bishop to block the door? Why should the Bishop say "I do not allege that you are an improper person, nor that you do not complain of a grave breach of the law, but I do say that litigation in the Ecclesiastical Courts is worse than the gravest errors of the Ritualistic doctrines which you seek to correct."

The grievances under which the laity suffer in the parishes of England in these matters are often more severely felt than any infringement of property or personal liberty, and yet, although in all civil complaints they may invoke the protection of the law, with regard to matters ecclesiastical they have no rights at all. If this Bill passes you simply put an edge on the law as it now exists, and you will sweep away an obstruction which cannot be juridically defended, and which, if swept away, will leave the Courts open, as they ought to be open, to every member of the Church of England who wishes to have the services in the simplicity in which the Reformation left them. I foresee no evil from this Bill being carried which any friend of the Church need apprehend. If a frivolous or vexatious suit were brought forward, the Bishop will have the power, subject to review by the Judge of the Court of Arches, to strike it out as frivolous or vexatious. If it were brought forward by a person who is a responsible person, ample security for costs will be provided, and then the law will be administered. A Bishop ought to be the last person to complain of being relieved of the painful and almost intolerable responsibility of being himself the author of such litigation.

There are three schools of thought relative to this question. There is that section which holds that the Church ought to have complete control over its own doctrines and ritual. With that party I have a most profound sympathy, but their views are only consistent with the constitution of a free church; they claim a liberty which the Church can never enjoy until the Acts of Uniformity have all been repealed, and you accept the condition of severance from the State. Then there is another school of opinion which holds that the Church should be left studiously alone: that the evolution of Christianity should proceed with no other check upon it than the conscience of the clergyman of each parish. Those who take this view will be among the opponents of this Bill, but they must remember that their attitude is consistent only with the repeal of the statutes imposing creeds and formularies upon the Church of England and a review of the concordat between Church and State. Then there is the third school—the lowly, humble, devoted members of the Church of their fathers, who only want its services conducted with the dignified simplicity in which the Reformation left them. I ask that this Bill should be passed into law in their interest, and in order that this state of things, which they highly value, should once more exist.

MR. VICARY GIBBS, (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): I desire to put before the House, as far as I am able, what I may call the view of moderate High Churchmen, as I conceive it to be in this matter; that is to say the view of men who equally disapprove of extreme and illegal practices, and of the Bill which has been introduced to-day. I hope the House will tolerate, as it generally does, the expression of unpopular opinions, provided they are expressed in a moderate form. The ostensible object of this Bill is to restore discipline in the Church, and I desire to show, if I can, that that result will not be attained, and I desire to show that particularly from the lessons of history. Some thirty years ago the High Church Party were eminently the party of law and order in the Church. That is to say, their special object was to show scrupulous attention to the rubrics of the Prayer-book, and to obey them with minute alacrity. Why, and when, did the change take place? I think the change is traceable to the attempt by a Civil Court, insufficiently armed by previous training and expert knowledge of ecclesiastical matters or Church history, to force on the Church its decisions as binding and permanent rules in matters of doctrine and ritual. I think that condition of disregard for authority was aggravated by the Public Worship Regulation Act, and would be still further aggravated if this Bill were to become law. Undoubtedly during the last twenty-five years there has been a disposition in certain quarters in the Church to embark upon practices which, if not actually illegal in every case, are, at any rate, strange and offensive to a large and most respect-worthy portion of the Church of England. I do not approve of those practices, even if they are shown to be legal; and least of all do I approve of them in country districts, where perhaps there is only one Church, and where if those practices offend the persons offended are practically excluded from the ministrations of the Church altogether. To remedy this undoubted grievance, the Bill proposes to allow that any parson, for any alleged breach of either doctrine or ritual, whether important or unimportant, can be brought before the Privy Council by any two or three persons who desire so to do, and be removed from his living. The ultimate Court of Appeal to which it is proposed to bring these gentlemen has been largely and widely discredited as a tribunal for deciding ecclesiastical causes. The very powerful Royal Commission, to the minority report of which the hon. and learned Gentleman who last spoke referred, though he did not mention the findings of the majority, reported against the Privy Council and in favour of a different plan; and therefore the authority of the Privy Council is challenged and weakened. Its own contradictory action in finding in favour of vestments in Liddell *v.* Westerton, and again in Martin *v.* Maconochie, followed by the Ridsdale judgment forbidding the use of vestments, on grounds which I do not think any lawyer would now maintain, has not helped to strengthen its authority. How can we expect the clergy of the Church of England to cheerfully yield obedience to such a tribunal? Let me quote from a man who will be received with general respect in this House. The historian Stubbs declared—

> "The maintenance of the existing jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as a final tribunal of appeal in matters of doctrine and ritual is not to be regarded as an essential part, or necessary historical consequence of the Reformation settlement."

It appears to me in essence undesirable that the civil Court should be called upon to decide, as this Bill would call on it, points of doctrine and ritual. Does it seem, to this House, reasonable that such a Court should define what is the proper doctrine of the English Church in the matter of baptismal regeneration? I do not think that that is a doctrine which can be defined by a civil Court which has not had long and careful ecclesiastical study. It is perfectly true there are many cases in the rubrics which are perfectly simple and perfectly clear. Let me take an illustration. The Prayer-book lays down that the Athanasian Creed must be read on Trinity Sunday, and at other times. If a clergyman declines to comply with that rubric, under this Bill he could be removed from his living. But the Prayer Book as a whole, or the rubrics, are not like an Act of Parliament, construable by any able lawyer, without a knowledge of ecclesiastical matters or Church history. Archbishop Benson, in the case of the Bishop of Lincoln, said—

> "It has established the impossibility of trying to find out the meaning and intention of the Prayer-book, merely by a study of words used in it, without a prolonged and careful study of the history that lies behind the words, and of the experience which made up the life of those who first employed them."

One thing is certain, and that is that a study of that history, which Archbishop Benson so justly praised the importance of, would reveal that there have always been in the Church of England since the Reformation a High Church, a Low Church, and a Broad Church, although they may have been called by different names, such as Calvinists, Armenians, Socinians. There is as much difference, in my judgment, between the views of Archbishops Abbot and Laud, in the time of Charles I., as there is to-day between the Church Association and the English Church Union. I would ask the House, although toleration does not seem to be in the ascendant to-day, whether they really desire to destroy the comprehension which was deliberately arranged for in the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England; and which, in my judgment, were not overlooked in the wording of some of the Church rubrics. It is perfectly true that the Church has not always shown that spirit of comprehension. I would remind the House that in the time of Elizabeth the Puritans were rejected from the Church; that at a later day, when the wheel had come full circle, the Nonjurors were rejected, and the Methodists, if not actually rejected, were so cold-shouldered that they were driven into schism. I would ask the House to consider whether the Church of England, speaking of it as a national Church, derived any advantage from this action. I would point out that it is with the High Church Party, and not with the extreme lawbreakers, that we should have to deal if this Bill became law.

As the hon. and learned Member for the Stretford Division said, this is a Church Association Bill. We know the Church Association methods, and we know its opinions. If we do not, it is not because it does not supply us with sufficient documentary matter. The Church Association says that there are from 8,000 to 10,000 lawbreakers among the clergy. That means that the bulk of the High Church Party are lawbreakers. I deny it. I am not prepared to hand over 8,000 or 10,000 of the clergy to the tender mercies of the Church Association, the body which I regard as a modern copy of the Inquisition, which, if this Bill became law, would in turn hand the clergy over to the secular arm, in the good old style. I assume if this Bill passes there will be an attempt to enforce the Ridsdale judgment in the civil Courts. Can any one seriously suppose that the way to secure discipline, or to obtain obedience, is by such means? It will merely have the effect of uniting the whole High Church Party together—the great mass who disapprove of extreme practices or extravagant ritual, and the very small portion who indulge in such practices in opposition to what they regard, and will justly regard, as intolerable prosecution: What shall we see? This Bill will put it in the power of any wrong-minded man to effect the following scandal. A hard-working, able, upright parson, beloved and followed by his entire congregation, supported and approved by his own diocesan, forcibly removed from his living, because he refuses to accept the ruling of a civil Court as to the disputable meaning of a rubric, although that ruling may run counter, not merely to his conscience, but to the judgment of the bulk of the Episcopate. If that point is reached, one of two things will happen. Either the people, seeing the preposterous condition of things that will ensue, will demand the repeal of this measure, or they will support it. If they support it, there will be an irresistible demand for Disestablishment. That, of course, would meet the wishes of the hon. and learned Member who last spoke, and of many hon. Members opposite. But will it meet the views of the men who are supporting this measure? I think not. I do not regard Disestablishment as the worst of the evils this Bill would cause.

I feel confident that if this Bill is passed in its present form, it will tear the Church of England to pieces, and will destroy a great living national organisation for good. I would ask hon. Members to consider what religious body would profit if the Church of England were thrown down from its national position and broken up into a number of sects. Why, the Church of Rome. It is into the hands of the Church of Rome that the hon. Members who are pressing for this Bill are unwittingly playing. This Bill hopes to avoid the scandal of imprisoning a man for conscience sake by substituting deprivation. But if there is to be forcible removal from the parsonage, as must inevitably follow, you may have an equally grave scandal; and we may have to thank Liverpool for introducing into other English cities the spectacle of religious riots. What sort of position does the House conceive will be that of a new incumbent who is forced on an unwilling congregation, supposing his views are different from those of the man who has been removed? Will it be a tenable position for any clergyman to hold? Or suppose, as is much more likely, that the same patron appoint a man of the same views, and the old clergyman remains, perhaps, under the nominal description of curate to the new vicar, what advantage will have been gained?

An HON. MEMBER: He will not get a licence.

Mr. VICARY GIBBS: I am assuming, and justly assuming, that under this Bill a man may be expelled under the decision of a civil Court which is directly contrary to the views of the Bishop of the diocese. If a vicar of similar views is appointed, does the House seriously contemplate entering into a conflict with the Church, and seeing a continuation of prosecutions in the same parish and for the same cause? I can hardly think it does, nor will it gain credit or advantage by encouraging or supporting a Bill which may lead to such a result.

As to the abolition of the veto, it has been pointed out very properly by the Archbishop that by living Bishops there have only been two cases of the exercise of the veto. The Archbishop further stated that the dying out of the prosecutions which were rife between 1875 and 1880 was owing not to the exercise of the veto but to a feeling growing up among the Evangelical party that they were not advancing the spread of their own views by being connected in men's minds with anything which could, even unfairly, be described as persecution. I fully admit and recognise the force of the remark of the hon. and learned Member opposite—that you cannot at the same time say that the veto has had no effect in stopping prosecutions, and also that the veto is a very valuable thing to preserve for the protection of the clergy. Those two propositions are mutually destructive, and I must select which I will support. I desire to preserve the veto, because it is in the interests of the clergy of the Church of England that it should be preserved. May I quote in support of the veto the Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts which sat in 1882-83.

> "But since the principal branch of ecclesiastical jurisdiction which now remains to the Courts is concerned with the correction of the clergy, it seems reasonable that the Bishop, rather than any private person, should decide whether the interests of the Church in any particular case require that a clerk should be prosecuted. We adopt the words of a Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench that it is 'better for the interests of religion and of the public that the Bishop, who is the overseer or superintendent of religious matters in the Church, should be entrusted with a discretion as to the propriety of issuing a commission of inquiry in such cases, than that it should be left entirely, as expressed by Sir Walter Scott, to the judgment or passions of private persons, who, under the influence of zeal, prejudice or fancy, might call peremptorily upon the Bishop, without any real or substantial ground, upon mere scandal and evil report, to institute proceedings which would cause at once expense, trouble, and vexation, and tend to create trouble and vexation in the Church.' It is better to make the Bishop responsible for his leave to set the discipline of the Church in motion, 'trusting to the due exercise of his discretion in all cases where it appears to him that the interests of the Church require it.'"

Now let me pass to the action of the Bishops themselves. Have they done nothing? The present Archbishop, whose opinion may be received with respect on all sides, says—

> "There is a marked modification and restraint as regards usages habitual a few years ago."

I know that in the matter of unauthorised services the late Bishop of London was the means practically of suppressing them in his diocese, and I know of my own knowledge that the Bishops made great efforts and brought great pressure to bear on the extreme clergy in their respective dioceses. I know also that their monitions have for the most part been received with respect and obedience. Therefore the Archbishop can truthfully say that cases of flagrant and defiant illegality and disobedience are very few and are generally confined to the large towns. How can anyone charge the Episcopate with incompetence in dealing with disputed questions of ritual and not give them credit for Archbishop Benson's judgment in the Bishop of Lincoln's case? That judgment had the unique merit among modern ritual judgments that it led to general obedience, and was sufficiently cogent to secure acceptance by the Privy Council, although it traversed and upset the grounds on which the Privy Council had previously proceeded.

Now let me point out what I regard as the way of remedy. I regard the evil as admitted, though exaggerated, and I have sought to show that the Court of Privy Council is not the right body to deal with spiritual matters. I admit the immense difficulty of establishing a new Court. That would undoubtedly open up the controversy as to the proper relations of Church and State as defined by the Statute of Appeals and the Act of Submission. The Bishops have now no legislative power whatever; they cannot sit as a Synod, issuing mandates with the force of law on ecclesiastical questions, and even if they could I am far from saying that that would establish perfect peace and harmony in the Church. What I do say is that the decisions of the whole of the Episcopate would be received by loyal Churchmen in a spirit of obedience, which they are far from showing, and cannot be expected to show, to such a civil Court as that before which questions of doctrine and ritual have hitherto been brought.

I should like to say a few words as to the history of this Privy Council Court. The appeal to the Crown was given as a machinery for doing justice to individuals, and not for the purpose of determining questions of doctrine and ritual. The old Court of Delegates never attempted to lay down what the doctrine and ritual of the Church were, and the judgments of its successor, the Privy Council, were given the same force and effect as those of the Court of Delegates had had, and no more. But of late there has been set up a claim for the Court of Privy Council, in my judgment as false historically as it is mischievous in practice, that they should decide what are, have been, and should be the doctrine and ritual of the Church of England. In that view I am entirely borne out by the Commission of 1882. In fact that Commission in their arguments and findings went directly against the whole conception of this Bill. They admit the right of every aggrieved person to approach the Crown for redress, and they provide a lay tribunal for that purpose; but they confine the Court to its proper duties, and recommend the restoration of the Provisional Court, invested with unquestionable ecclesiastical authority, leaving, to use their own words, "the full hearing of spiritual matters to a spiritual judge."

I have no time to develop the matter, but it is clear to me that the only real remedy is to give the Church authorities some such powers as are possessed by the Church of Scotland. I maintain that the appeal to the civil Courts should be in the case of an abuse of justice, and that their proper function is to correct such abuse should it occur. I quite admit that such a measure would require the greatest ability to prepare, and equal ability to pass through this House, and as any Bill of this kind must vitally affect the condition of the Church of England, I maintain that it is in accordance with every precedent, except perhaps such as can be drawn from the Long Parliament, that such a measure should be introduced by a Minister of the Crown in his representative capacity as representing the King, and I hardly think the hon. Member who introduced the Bill now under discussion can claim such a position as that.

As the hon. Member for the East Toxteth Division is now in his place, I should like to say a word in reference to his remarks concerning Keble College. He made an attack on the Council of Keble, and read out my father's name as being on the Council. Had the hon. Member given me notice that he proposed to attack the Council of Keble, or had I conceived that it was germane to this issue, I would have been prepared to answer him, and to dispute certain of his facts. At the moment I am unable to do so, except in one particular. He led the House to suppose, as no doubt he supposed himself, that the appointment of the present vicar of St. John's, Plymouth, whom he rightly described as engaged in practices which I imagine would not meet with the approval of more than one Member of this House, was made by the Keble Council. In that he is mistaken, as the appointment was made before the living passed into the hands of the Council of Keble.

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR: I did not in any way base my complaint of the Council of Keble on any one church in particular, but on a total of seventeen churches, all of which, in my judgment, are outside the limits of the Church of England in one or other of their services.

Mr. VICARY GIBBS: At any rate it creates uneasiness in one's mind as to the accuracy of the hon. Member's account of the Keble Council, when the illustration that he chose was unfounded, because Keble was in no way responsible for the appointment. In conclusion, how is it there has been this enormous increase of High Church opinion and practices in the country? Is it not reasonable to suppose that the spread of this opinion is due to the zeal, energy, and missionary activity of that branch of the Church? There was a time when all the zeal was on the side of the Low Church party, and then they came to the front. If you go to the lowest parts of any of our great cities now you will probably find that the clergyman is a High Churchman, and often an advanced High Churchman, and although you may disapprove of his actions in many respects you cannot deny the affection, regard, and sympathy with which he is followed by the poorest of the people. Can we not draw a moral from that? If the Low Church party desire to counterbalance that activity, they should follow the same methods; they should go among the people and preach, and teach, and work, showing how wrong are the High Church party and how right the Low Church party. It is not by bombarding Members of the House of Commons with printed post-cards from the Church Association that the victory in religious questions is to be secured; it is by following the methods of Wesley and Whitfield, and not those of Mr. Kensit and the Church Association.

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, W. Derby): I understand that the question before the House is that of the good government of the English Church, and that, I take it, is not so much a question for the Bishops and the beneficed clergy, as the hon. and learned Member for the Stretford Division would have us believe, as for the whole of the common people of this realm. Indeed, having regard to the ministrations that are required at the most solemn moments of most people's lives, I should not be going too far if I claimed that this question of the clergy is perhaps the most important that could possibly come before this House. What is the position in which we find the matter to-day? It has been admitted by speaker after speaker that the position is nothing but chaos. The foundations of the faith, which were to some extent fixed by the Reformation, are being daily called into question and openly defied, and there is no adequate machinery to enforce obedience. The patience of the common people has been strained to such a point that it is almost exhausted. It is not to the advantage of the Church that this state of things should continue, and it is, I submit, a scandal to the community. We claim to be a practical people, and we ought to consider calmly the steps to be taken to put an end to the existing state of affairs. There is no wish to adopt harsh measures, or to strain the law when it is ascertained, but what we demand is that there should be some means of ascertaining clearly what the law is, and some effective means of seeing that that law is carried into effect.

The Church of England unfortunately differs from almost every other organised religious body in the fact that there is no practical means by which the representatives of the congregation or the laity, or any other constituted body, can get rid of a clergyman who disobeys the law, or of whom they otherwise disapprove. Even in the Greek Church, the oldest of Christian communities, there are churchwardens in every church, who make a bargain with the clergyman when he is beneficed, and in every case, subject to that bargain, have the right to give him reasonable notice to go if they disapprove of his doctrine or anything else. In the Roman Catholic Church, the priests, secular and regular, are directly subject to the Bishop of the diocese in which the church to which they are attached is situated, and the Bishop can deprive them of their living and position, and habitually does so, if he has reason to complain of their conduct, both parties—not one alone as is suggested by the Bill of the hon. and learned Member for the Stretford Division — having an appeal to Rome.

The Wesleyan body, a great and important community in the country, have their trust deeds applicable to every one of their sacred edifices, under which they are able immediately to dispense with the services of a clergyman who is proved to have departed from the tenets of their order or violated their doctrines; they also have the further safeguard that they need not invite a minister for more than one year, so that they can very speedily put an end to a state of affairs to which they object. I could go on to give instances of all the other denominations—the Presbyterians, who through their Court of Session, which is practically composed of laymen, with a right of appeal to the Presbytery and the Synod, have the same power; the Congregationalists, who have their trust-deeds whereby, under a special resolution, almost the same as that of a limited liability company, they can discharge their minister and select another. Even the Mohammedans, of whom many millions are our fellow-subjects, are not subject to the same kind of difficulty in this respect as are we in the Church of England. What we want is some speedy and satisfactory remedy by which to put an end to the present state of affairs. There is a doubt in all directions as to what the law on various points connected with ceremonial and ritual is. Some clergymen of the Church of England decline to obey the civil Courts; they have set even the Privy Council at defiance; most of them refuse to obey their Bishops. This Bill proposes a simple method of getting rid of the difficulty. It is not desired to perpetuate martyrdom in the Church. When a clergyman is convicted of a breach of ceremonial or ritual the punishment of imprisonment is a harsh and barbarous remedy which does no good to anyone, and gives the clergyman a chance of figuring as a martyr. The Bill also proposes to abolish the veto.

On each occasion when this subject has come before the House in a practical form certain well-known phenomena have made their appearance. In the first place there has been an outbreak of Ministerial perturbation. That is not to be wondered at. Every Ministry has to rely upon both High Church and Low Church supporters. I do not suggest that the desire to avoid dealing with this subject in a practical manner arises from selfishness on the part of the Ministry. I suggest it is rather an attitude of aloofness; they would rather take up the attitude of "a plague on both your houses." Then, in the next place, we have seen a flutter in the Episcopal dovecote. This has been especially the case on the present occasion. Only a few days ago there were three or four columns of the daily press devoted to an exposition of the position by the Archbishop, and what did it amount to? It was simply an elaborate attempt to prove that nothing has been done in the past to put an end to these practices; ["No."] that nothing could be done in the future; ["No."] that nothing should be done in the future; ["No."] and it ended with a pathetic appeal to stiffen and strengthen parental authority. The attitude of the Bishops with regard to this subject very much resembles that of the mother with her spoilt offspring; she is unable to beat him herself for misbehaviour, and would have a fit of hysterics if anyone suggested a policeman should be called in.

Another thing we meet with when this subject is brought forward is vitriolic abuse of Liverpool and of the sources from which this Bill is assumed to emanate. At an important meeting lately we were dubbed as representing "truculent rascality;" and it has been said that this Bill is dishonest; that it emanates from Liverpool; that it is "the product of disreputable fanatics, conceived during drunken orgies." Speaking for my native city, I desire to take this opportunity of denying that suggestion, and to tell the House that the men who think with us on this matter—the Protestant men of Liverpool—are men with strong religious convictions. They have hundreds of Bible classes in the city. I know of one Bible class with a membership of 250 men, with an average attendance every week of 185, while only the other day I had the pleasure of presenting a prize to a man who had attended the Bible class every Sunday morning without missing for twenty-five years. That is the kind of spirit with which you have to deal. Those are the men who helped to make this country, and who had the Protestantism of this country at heart. They are the men who intend to do their best to maintain it, and they will maintain it, and with it those principles of the liberty and privileges of the people which they believe to be inseparably connected with, and dependent upon, the Protestant convictions of this country.

We have had the usual speech from the noble President of the Church Union, which is a masterpiece of disingenuousness from end to end. He says that he will obey neither the Bishops nor the Privy Council. We have to-day in this House the usual counter Resolution or the usual counter Bill, and that has come from the hon. Member for Stretford. What is the object of bringing forward that Bill in this way? It is in order to ensure that nothing shall be done. Our Bill is simple and straightforward. The last time this Bill was brought forward it was much more complicated and lengthy, and then we were to take our measure away because it was far too complicated and lengthy to be taken into consideration. Now, Sir, we bring forward a very simple, straightforward little Bill, and we are told that it is not complicated and comprehensive enough, and we are immediately presented with as comprehensive and complicated a document as the hon. and learned Member for Stretford could possibly prepare. And then we are asked, forsooth, to take the two Bills together, in order to make a thoroughly disagreeable mixture, which is supposed to be the best thing for the patient; and to take both Bills together and send them to a Select Committee, from which it is well known they could not possibly come down to have anything done to them, and so the whole subject will be burked. I hope that every hon. Member of this House who has any desire to see this subject dealt with in a straightforward and simple manner will decline to entertain any such suggestion as mixing up this complicated and difficult measure, which the hon. Member for Stretford has brought forward, with the simple Bill which has been introduced by my hon. friend. I do hope that the House will carry the Second Reading of this Bill.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): The House has before it this afternoon a very great question and a very limited time in which to discuss it. There are many topics which properly belong to this question on which I should like to enter; but we ought to bring ourselves to examine as much as possible what is the position in which we stand, and what is the method of dealing with it which is most appropriate. There are some people who think that this is a matter with which the House of Commons ought to have nothing to do. [Hear, hear.] Yes, that will be the case when there is no National Established Church. As long as such a Church exists it is the right and duty of Parliament to see that the conditions of that institution are lawfully and properly upheld. The Established National Protestant Church of England was the work of the great Reformation. It rests on three fundamental principles. It began with the Act of Submission of the clergy, which removed the ecclesiastical hierarchy from the position in the Church which it had previously occupied. Next was the declaration of the supremacy of the Crown, which enunciated and established the fact that the National Church was not the Church of the ecclesiastics, but the Church of the nation as represented by the Crown and by Parliament. The third process in the establishment of the National Church was the enactment of certain formularies—the Prayer-book and the Thirty-nine Articles—which furnished the standard and embodied the conditions on which that Church rests, and upon which the clergy hold their emoluments and their privileges. I think that is a correct description.

LORD HUGH CECIL: No.

* SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Well, if the noble Lord will allow me to say so, that is the Protestant doctrine of the reformed Church and he may regard me, as the name implies, as a protestor against the system which Protestantism displaced. If that is the situation, it is quite plain that what we have to examine is whether these conditions are being at the present time fulfilled by the clergy of the Church of England. Is it even alleged that that is so? Some people differ as to the amount to which those conditions have been violated; some say that there are very few cases of violation; but it is not the violators themselves who say so. They say that there are very many. But if they are very few, why are they not put a stop to? The fewer they are the easier it ought to be to deal with them. The persons who have the rigth to the establishment, the affirmation, and the carrying out of the law are the people of this country, the laity of this country; and the persons whose duty it is in the first instance to enforce the law are the Bishops. Some years ago Lord Salisbury said that the Church was in a state of anarchy, that it was the duty of the Bishops to bring order into the Church, and that if they did not they ought to be punished. I do not know that Lord Salisbury indicated the express form which that punishment ought to take. But the question is whether or not the Bishops have been able or willing to produce such order in the Church. That that order does not exist in the Church every one will admit. I cannot go into a detailed demonstration of this. I would rather take the concise explanation of the state of the Church given by the highest dignitary in the land next to the Archbishop of Canterbury—the Lord Chancellor. Speaking on a celebrated Clause in the Education Bill the Lord Chancellor said:—

> "The object of the Clause is to restrain the clergy who had availed themselves of their opportunities to do that which was repugnant to the whole general body of the laity of the Church of England, who had sought to get rid of the old traditions of the Reformation to which the Church of England was indisputably wedded."

But we have higher authority still that this is a state of things which ought to be dealt with and got rid of. Only the other day the present Archbishop of Canterbury said:—

> "There are a few men defiant of episcopal authority and really reckless of the true Church of England spirit. I say to you deliberately to-day that in my view of such cases tolerance has reached, and has even passed, its limits."

Then the Archbishop goes on:—

> "The sands are running out. Stern and drastic acts, in my judgment, are quite essential, and, using the word with a full sense of responsibility, I desire that we should act, and act sternly."

The Archbishop further says that besides these cases which are intolerable there are a great many cases which are very near the line, and which are calling at this moment for anxious and careful attention on the part of the Bishops. Then there is a case to be dealt with, and one with which Parliament is bound to deal. I read with satisfaction that statement by the present Archbishop of Canterbury. But I read five years ago with equal satisfaction a statement by the same prelate, who was then Bishop of Winchester, in which diocese I have the pleasure of living. And in the promotion of the Bishop of Winchester all I can say is that the only drawback I feel is that we have lost him in the diocese of Winchester. But in 1898 I read the first charge of the Bishop of Winchester, in which he said—

> "The Bishops and clergy have been of late years too lax or, to use a colloquial expression, too casual. Episcopal authority will now be exercised decisively, and, if need be, sternly, wherever in England any difficulty arises."

That was the pledge given five years ago, that action would be decisively and sternly taken. The question to-day is why was that action during the last five years not decisively and sternly taken? Because it is that dereliction which has brought us to the position in which we now stand. These are not mere questions of ritual; they go to the whole root of the matter; and I should like to read a few words of that charge which show how the Bishop went to the root of the matter with which it was necessary decisively and sternly to deal. He said—

> "The gravest danger of all is to be seen in the teaching and usages of an increasing number of parish priests with respect to the Holy Communion . . . swinging back half unconsciously into something like the materialistic doctrines of the fifteenth century . . . and insensibly drifting away from the true proportion of the faith of the Church of England into the peril of something sadly like the materialistic superstitions of pre-Reformation days."

It is impossible, in my opinion, to express more weightily and more truly the real gravity of this matter, and why it is necessary that stern measures should be taken to deal with it. He says—

> "Test this above all by the little booklets of Eucharistic devotion and instruction which are circulating widely in our congregations, circulating especially among the most earnest of our younger communicants."

Then he speaks of—

> "The growing tendency among certain men to ignore and explain away the distinctive character of the Church of England, the Church, not Catholic only, but Reformed; to forget, or at all events not to adhere to, the principles for which the Reformers cared and fought and suffered."

That was the evil five years ago. That is the evil which exists now, which in my opinion has grown and increased with the impunity enjoyed by the offenders in the last five years. We were promised five years ago by the Bishop of Winchester, in the name of the Bishops, that it should then be sternly and decisively dealt with. It has not been so dealt with; and the question is whether we should take security that it shall be so dealt with now. What is the course the Bishops have taken in the last five years? They have not been inattentive to this question. They have met on frequent occasions. They met in 1899, and came to certain resolutions condemning certain practices and certain doctrines. The Pastoral of the Archbishop of York set forth these resolutions. What took place? The moment the resolutions were published there was held a meeting at the Holborn Town-hall, summoned by the authorities of the English Church Union. There were present 220 incumbents. They drew up a letter, which they served upon all the Bishops, and in which they said:—

> "The clergy owe it to the whole Catholic Church"

—not the Church of England, mind—

> "faithfully to refuse to obey any demands even though they come from authority"

—that is to say, the declaration to which the Bishops had unanimously come at Lambeth—

> "which conflict with the law, customs, and rights of the Church, whether œcumenical or personal, which have canonical authority."

And they solemnly declared, in direct contradiction to the findings of the Episcopate, that—

> "The right of reservation and ceremonial use of incense cannot and must not be abandoned."

You would have supposed that the Bishops, in the face of this insolent defiance, would have taken instant steps on this occasion to enforce the declarations they had solemnly come to. Not at all. There was not the smallest reason why any or all of the Bishops under the Act of 1840 should not have proceeded against any of these defiant and recalcitrant clergy and removed them and had them deprived. There was no question of imprisonment. Under the Act of 1840 it would have been perfectly possible, in the presence of this solemn and public defiance, to have removed and deprived these men, as they ought to have been deprived, of their emoluments. Why was not that done? The thing went on. Defiances went on day after day, week after week, on the part of a certain set of men. Any one who has taken pains to examine the matter knows that it is not a small number of men, but that a very large number of men are banded together and organised for the avowed purpose of undoing the work of the Reformation. I am quite willing that they should do their best, but on one condition—that they should surrender those emoluments and privileges and rights which they only acquired by swearing solemnly to observe certain laws, which they deliberately of set purpose violated. What was the next proceeding? It was still more extraordinary. The late Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Temple, of whom I wish to speak with the highest regard and respect, took a most singular course. He thought that it was a good thing to have a hearing at Lambeth, where both sides should state their views of the case, and then he would deliver his judgment; and he expected, I suppose, that some respect would be paid to that judgment when delivered; but he was careful to explain the nature of the proceeding.

> "The Bishop is to say what the rubric means. He can then enjoin the observance of it, and the oath of canonical obedience—the Canonical Oath—requires the clergyman to obey the Bishop's injunction. The Bishop cannot in any way use coercion. The sanction is the clergyman's double promise. If the clergyman determines to break that promise, the Bishop can use no compulsion. The appeal is to the man's conscience and to the sacredness of a promise without which he could not have entered the ministry at all."

Every one knows the contempt with which this declaration was treated. The findings of the Archbishops were spurned as the personal opinions of Dr. Temple which were of no account. The oath of canonical obedience was derided. If the Primates, instead of taking this course, had pronounced their judgments in their own Courts, they would have taken effect; but they deliberately took a course which they must have known would have no effect on the conscience of men who declared that their conscience demanded that they should take exactly the opposite course to that prescribed by the Prayer-book and by the Bishops and Archbishops. Therefore a more futile proceeding it was impossible to conceive than this Lambeth hearing, which deliberately abandoned and disavowed any intention of giving effect to its decisions, and was treated, and has been treated ever since, with contempt by those who desired not to obey. That is really the state of things to which we have been brought. The Bishops have always had the power in their own courts to summon any man who in their opinion was doing that which was contrary to the law of the Church. They have utterly failed; in fact, they have deliberately determined not to do it; and that is the state of things which has brought us, after five years of probation of Episcopal authority, to the situation in which we now find ourselves, and in which the Archbishop of Canterbury has stated that the condition of things is intolerable, and that something stern and decisive must be done at last. That is really, I believe, not an exaggerated but an accurate account of what has taken place in the last five years in regard to the discipline and the government of the Established Church.

I wish, with all decent respect, to say that in my opinion this condition of things has arisen from the fact that the Episcopacy of this country have not discharged the duty incumbent upon them to enforce the law of the Church in the manner prescribed by the constitution of the Established Church of this country. We have witnessed the melancholy spectacle of a band of mutinous priests setting at nought a Bench of intimidated Bishops, conformably to their consecration oath. That is hardly disputed by the Archbishop. He gave a frank avowal, an *apologia*, of the course which has hitherto been taken in this matter. It is said that a certain amount has been done in the way of modification. Well, I do not quite understand what modification means. Does it mean observance of the law, or does it not ? or does it mean some half-and-half compromise which is not an observance of the law of the Church as it is defined in the formularies of the Church ? Is it a sort of semi-Protestant, semi-Roman arrangement made between individuals and the Bishops, who say, "Well, I'll let you do this and not that" ? There is really too much of this secret confabulation, which we are told has had a most beneficial effect. But that is not the way in which an evil of this kind can be dealt with. It is not a matter for arrangement between individuals. It must be a real and definite rule binding in all alike on all important matters. I am speaking of things which go to the root of the distinction between the Protestant Church of England and the Roman Church, that vital distinction which is thoroughy understood and is laid down in the formularies of the Church that are found in the Articles and the Prayer-book. That is not a subject for compromise at all. There is a certain latitude and interpretation. Everybody admits that. There are matters which may be regarded as doubtful.

But you must have some tribunal by which that subject is to be decided, and it must be a single and final tribunal, because, if you are to leave it to each individual Bishop to determine you will have a different usage in every diocese, and you will have that chaos and confusion which was one of the great evils sought to be remedied by the Statute of Uniformity.

I wish to say one word more upon the question of compromise. What the laity have a right to demand is that the law of the Church shall be observed in all churches everywhere. It is not for any congregation to demand unlawful services, and the Bishops have no dispensing form by which they can compromise the law of the Church. I come to the question of the veto. That there should be some power of preventing frivolous and vexatious suits I think everybody admits, but everybody knows the practice that lies at the bottom of this veto. What the late Archbishop Temple said about the veto is perfectly true. He said that the Bishop was a considerable power in unimportant matters in preventing litigation, but he used these words, which are important and, I think, the real definition of the matter:—

> "It is obvious that it would be an abuse of the Bishop's power if he was thus to permit any serious violation of the law."

It was pointed out in the admirable speech of my hon. and learned friend the Member for Leeds how that veto was introduced some twenty five or thirty years ago, and how it has practically operated ever since. It is perfectly plain that if the Bishops prevented the laity from making use of the final Court of Appeal—that is the Court of the Crown—whose supremacy in cases ecclesiastical as well as civil is the privilege of the subject—it would be a gross abuse. What we have to see to is that the laity shall have access to a tribunal which shall assert the law as it is. That is the position in which we stand with regard to the veto. How is it that such scandalous cases as those at Devonport have been allowed to go on? Most gentlemen have read what took place with reference to the schoolmaster and the clergyman there. I hope and believe that proceedings are now going to be taken to relieve the Church from such a scandal as that.

LORD HUGH CECIL remarked that the clergyman in that case obeyed the Bishop.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I will not go into the case. I want to keep out of particular cases and to give my attention as far as possible to the general principle. The hon. and learned Member for Leeds suggested, I think, a very good method of limiting the veto—viz., that the Ecclesiastical Court should in the first instance disallow and set aside frivilous and vexatious proceedings. As to the rival Bill promoted by the hon. and learned Member for Stretford, I quite agree with my hon. and learned friend the Member for Leeds that the Bill is absolutely destructive of the right of the laity to ask for the vindication of the law of the Church. If anybody will read the first two clauses of that Bill he will see that its object is that the whole matter shall be settled between the clergyman and the Bishop. The Bishop may be disposed or may not be disposed to call the clergyman to account. The Bill says—

> "When complaint shall be made to a Bishop charging a clergyman within the diocese of such Bishop with an offence or offences in matters of doctrine or the conduct of public worship, the Bishop shall call upon such clergyman to give, either personally or in writing, an explanation of the alleged offence or offences, and if it shall appear to the Bishop that such explanation is not a sufficient answer to such charge, it shall be lawful for such Bishop to issue a monition to such clergyman requiring him to obey his directions and setting out the offence or offences from which he directs him to desist."

Then if the clergyman wishes to appeal to the higher Court he has a right to do so. What is the position of the layman complainant? The layman complainant is not heard of any more. Perhaps the Bishop and the clergyman come to an understanding as to what is to be done. The clergyman follows out what the Bishop says. He uses incense and reserves the sacrament in a particular way which meets the view of the Bishop and the view of the clergyman. But the complainant holds that that is not the law of the Church; that the law of the Church forbids the incense, forbids the reservation of the sacrament. Supposing he says "I do not agree in the monition you have given; I do not think the monition is in accordance with the law of the Church, and I claim that the law of the Church shall be ascertained." Then perhaps the Bishop says "I have arranged with the clergyman what it is right to do. I consider that under these circumstances the matter is settled, therefore, I use my veto."

MR. CRIPPS: The right hon. Gentleman assumes that because the Bill has been produced in this form the rights of laymen under the Discipline Act of 1840, or the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, have been interfered with. I cannot discuss it, but I entirely deny that. He has all the rights he has now.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: When a complainant comes forward to claim his right to proceed under the Church Discipline Act, and to carry the case to the supreme tribunal of the Church he may be told by the Bishop that he has already dealt with the matter. The worst of this arrangement is that it will never lead to a decision upon any point which is to govern all the Bishops, all the clergy, and all the Church. There will be separate decisions upon each of these points in every diocese by each Bishop according to his separate proclivities. An arrangement which would lead to greater chaos and anarchy in the Church than the proposals in that Bill I cannot conceive. In my opinion there is only one proper course to take, and that is to make due provision for the prevention of frivolous and vexatious suits, but to open the doors of the law and the administration of the law in ecclesiastical matters as much as in civil matters to the subjects of the realm—that is what they are entitled to under an Established Church. If you do not like interference in this matter, disestablish the Church. In the establishment of the Church ecclesiastical tribunals have been erected. Those tribunals are perfectly accessible. The decision in the first instance is in the hand of the Bishop or Archbishop. The pretence that they could not be used for the purposes of discipline is utterly unfounded. I have consulted the greatest legal authorities who are most experienced in these matters, and I have asked whether there was or is any difficulty whatever in a man who refused to obey the law as it was laid down by the Bishops themselves being deprived. The reply was "none whatever." It can be done in a clear case in a brief period and at small expense. Wherever the case is clear, and the Bishops at Lambeth have made clear what in their opinion the law is, what ought to be done is to take proceedings to enforce the law; that being the case, I have no hesitation in supporting the Bill introduced by the hon. Member for Liverpool.

I certainly could not vote for the hon. and learned Member for Stretford's Bill, for, in my opinion, to pass that Bill would be to make things a great deal worse than they are at present. It is absolutely inconsistent with the principles and constitution of the Established Church that it should practically be left to the Bishops and clergy to determine what is the law of the Church. That would be the outcome of the Bill of the hon. and learned Member. Allowing there would be access to the Court by a layman under the Church Discipline Act, still this introductory procedure in which a layman would have no part, would, in point of fact, give the veto such power as would practically leave the matter entirely and exclusively in the hands of the Bishop and clergy. That is not the principle of the law of the Church of England; that is not enforcing the right of the laity in that Church; and I believe the state of opinion among the clergy and the differences of opinion existing among Bishops would not tend to the removal of the anarchy, the chaos, in which the Church finds itself, but would rather aggravate that condition of things. If the House wishes to do something to encourage the dealing with disorders with that decisive and stern temper of which the Archbishop of Canterbury has spoken, the proper course, which I hope will be taken by a great majority, will be to pass the Second Reading of this Bill.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The House will probably think it right that I should say a few words on this subject;

but I ought to preface those words by stating that I do not speak on behalf of my colleagues on this bench. This is not a Government question, and the views I propose to express, with as much brevity and lucidity as I can command, bind no man but myself, and ought not to be taken as the opinion of anyone but the opinion of the speaker. Yet I feel so strongly on the subject, I am so conscious of the danger, which to my thinking the Church is now running through the action of extremists on both sides of the question, I feel so intensely the peril which—I am afraid I must use the word—disloyal Churchmen are bringing to the Church to which they belong, and the danger, the corresponding danger, which we run from the opposition their proceedings naturally provoke, that I feel bound in conscience to take the course, always a disagreeable one to both sides, of adopting a middle position that finds friends nowhere. I have listened with great attention to the speech with which the hon. Member for Liverpool introduced this Bill. He has not had great practice in our debates, but nobody who heard his exposition of the Bill this afternoon can doubt that, whatever may be the subject occupying the attention of this House, we shall always be glad to hear the hon. Member express his opinion upon it. My hon. friend uttered a great many general propositions with which I find myself in the heartiest agreement. For instance, he told us the position is most serious, and in that I express my agreement. He also told us that as things are now the rights of the laity do not get their proper recognition in our ecclesiastical system, and with that proposition I am in the heartiest agreement. I shall have a word or two to say later on as to his particular method of introducing the lay element into ecclesiastical proceedings; but with the general view that the laity are more deeply, more passionately, concerned with the services given in the Church to which they belong even than the clergy, with that proposition I am in perfect accord.

I said I was in the ungracious position of having some grounds of complaint against all the parties, almost all the parties, concerned in this controversy. I need say nothing about the Extremists, whose proceedings have brought all this trouble upon the Church. I have condemned them often, in this House and out of this House, and I need not now elaborate this point. I have to add that I do not think we have in recent controversy obtained all the help we might have expected from the historic Moderate High Church party. That is a party having as good a claim, to put it moderately, to its place in the Church as any other party in our ecclesiastical system; and I believe they profoundly dissent from the Extremists. But for some reason which is intelligible, but does not supply an adequate excuse, I do not think they have come forward with sufficient argument and expression of opinion that these practices are contrary to the spirit and traditions of the Church to which they belong, and ought to be suppressed. I think if this party had taken a bolder course in the earlier stages, we might have been saved a great deal of trouble to the Church, and saved from a great many of the dangers we now run. When I say this of the historic High Church party, I am bound to add, as regards the militant Low Church party, though I approve their motives and honour their courage and consistency to their policy, I do not think they have come forward with that careful charity and anxious sifting of all the facts, that earnest desire not to inflame unnecessarily those religious passions which seem, for some mysterious reason, to be more easily inflamed than those other passions to which poor human nature is subject, I think it is desirable they should maintain in a controversy of this great difficulty and complexity.

Well, my Lords—[laughter]—I must add, and I say it with all respect—in my mind I was addressing the Episcopal Bench. While I feel some grounds of complaint against all parties, I cannot absolve the Episcopal Bench of some share of blame. I am perfectly certain that one and all, whatever their opinions may be, have earnestly striven to diminish the evils complained of and to properly order the Church in which they are the supreme spiritual authority. But I do not think they have thoroughly realised how deep, how bitter, is the feeling in large sections of the most respectable laity in the country which these practices have aroused. The feeling that does find violent and often regrettable expression in certain phases of the controversy is shared by many who take no part in public controversy, who say little, but who, because they say little, do not feel less. I do not deny that the position of a Bishop is far more difficult than, perhaps, the right hon. Gentleman will admit—I mean the position of a Bishop during the last four or five years. The difficulty arises from this, and I am afraid it rises from the fault of his predecessor. A condition of things has been allowed to grow up in large centres of population, and also in other places, which ought never to have existed; but, as it does exist, he feels the utmost difficulty in suppressing it by a single violent stroke. There may be dissent from what I say in the minds of some who hear me or who read my words. I disclaim any sympathy with practices which have been condemned to-day; but I want hon. Gentlemen to place themselves in the position of a Bishop who finds himself called to a diocese for the condition of which he becomes responsible, and in which in certain churches ther are practices which are not merely illegal, not merely breaking the law, but are of a kind which, using a convenient phrase, I will call Romanising. I use the word, not as indicating the intention of the clergyman, but the direction in which the practices might lead a congregation. I am not putting any exaggeration. The Bishop finds that in a particular case some of these mistaken but earnest and devoted men have carried into a region which is practically that of heathenism the light of religious expression, from the form of which we may dissent as illegal, but which, at all events, is religion. The Bishop knows that, if he adopts an instantaneous and drastic method of procedure to enforce his own opinion, he at once puts an end to the whole of the spiritual work in that locality. Is it then to be wondered at that the bishop decides, "I will try what personal influence can do with this clergyman. I will go to him, not as a prosecutor, but as a spiritual superior, and induce him to reform his practices, which he has been allowed without interruption or complaint to carry on for twenty years, and to which an entire generation of worshippers have become accustomed. I will persuade him to modify his practices, and to bring them into conformity with the teachings of the Church." The right hon. Gentleman calls this a secret compromise, or—what was the word ?—confabulation—of which the laity have a right to complain. I am not sure that in some cases there has not been too much tolerance of illegalities, but remember again and put yourself in the place of the Bishop. If this erring clergyman made large concessions to the demands of his spiritual superior, is it wholly unreasonable, does it show indifference to the Protestant character of the Church, if the Bishop should not at once put into operation against this great spiritual influence in the parish all the engines of the courts of law ? We may regret it; we may think that the considerations I have endeavoured to explain to the House have, in some cases, been allowed too great weight by the Bishops concerned; but they have produced a great improvement, and they have produced that improvement without causing any scandal, any schism, any great division of opinion, and without destroying any of the vital seeds of religion which have been so freely sown by clergymen whom they have had under them. Therefore, Sir, I think it is only fair to the Bishops to make, I will not call it, this halting defence of them, but to point out to my hon. friends, who, I am sure, appreciate what I have said, how difficult is the position of a Bishop when he finds himself face to face with the condition of things which he does not approve of, and which was created for him by the mistaken laxity of those who preceded him in office.

Let me say one word more. What I am now going to say about the Bishops no Bishop will say for himself. It is that surely we ought to do something to amend the law which throws the whole of the costs upon the Episcopal Bench. The right hon. Gentleman opposite says, and he alleges he has high authority for saying it, that the costs are trivial. I do not question his authority, but those whom I have consulted give me a wholly different view of the situation; and every Bishop who brings a case into

Court knows that he will largely diminish an income which, whatever hon. Gentlemen opposite may think, is none too great for the heavy calls made upon it. It is our bounden duty to remember that, because we shall never be reminded of it by the Bishops themselves; but I trust that, whenever we are in a position, as I hope we shall be soon, to deal practically with this subject, the aspect of it which I have just presented may not be excluded.

Now I come to the essence of my hon. friend's Bill. I shall say nothing about the later clauses, for everyone knows that it is a Bill for the abolition of the veto, and practically this is all we have to consider to-day. That is the backbone of the Bill. Now surely it was incumbent upon the promoters of this Bill, and upon such defenders of the Bill as the right hon. Gentleman opposite, to bring before us cases in which the veto has been abused by the Bishops. Well, what is the reply? No cases of abuse on the part of any of the Bishops can, I believe, be produced. I think we should have some evidence that this veto has been misused; and there could have been no difficulty in producing unlimited evidence if that misuse had existed. It was only necessary for my hon. friend, and those with whom he has legitimate influence, if they thought that they had a flagrant and obvious case, to institute a prosecution, and if the Bishop had stepped forward and put a veto on that prosecution I think everybody would have said, "Here is an evident intention on the part of a particular Bishop, at all events, to use the veto for a purpose which never was intended—namely, to prevent the law from being invoked in a clearly proper case." Why has that not been done? I cannot imagine; I do not know. My hon. friend did not tell us that. No speaker in the debate has told us. I am utterly at a loss to understand how we improve the position of the Church by abolishing a veto which has practically never been used in the time of any Member of the Episcopal Bench.

MR. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): The return to this House shows that out of twenty-three cases in which complaints have been made under the Public Worship Regulation Act seventeen have been vetoed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: But if my hon. friend means, as I suppose he does mean, that the veto which he seeks to abolish has been exercised seventeen times during the time of the present occupants of the Episcopal Bench, he is mistaken.

MR. CHARLES McARTHUR: No. I mean that from the time that the Public Worship Regulation Act was passed until two years ago, twenty-three complaints were made, and of these seventeen were vetoed by the Bishops.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think my hon. friend will find that the statement of the Archbishop publicly made yesterday does not support that view, and any further investigation I have made on the subject entirely confirms it. We may take it that the veto has not been used by the present occupants of the Episcopal Bench during their term of office; and therefore I say that we should have a proof of misuse before we abolish it. And may I emphasise that argument by asking my hon. friend whether in his view anything of the nature of illegal or extreme practices takes place in the diocese of Liverpool? I ask that because my hon. friend has personal experience; but I also ask it because there is a kind of implication running through this controversy that the Bishops who misuse this veto belong to the High Church school, and that they misuse it in the defence of extreme ritualistic practices. Nobody has ever charged either the late occupant, or the present occupant, of the See of Liverpool with any sympathy with high ritualistic practices. I want to know whether in the diocese of Liverpool the veto has been used, and whether, if it has not been used, there are any illegal practices which my hon. friend desires to put down; and if there are such practices in the diocese, I want to know how they will be cured by abolishing the veto, unless my hon. friend thinks that the present Bishop is a person who would interpose his veto for the purpose of sheltering a delinquent.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The Bishop of Liverpool himself has delivered a charge, which has been quoted, and which contained the complaint of the existence of these practices and of the mischief they were doing.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Bishop himself?

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Yes. He says that—

> "There has arisen out of the heart of the High Church revival a body of extreme men who, while holding to almost every Roman doctrine, contrive to satisfy their conscience so that they can honestly remain in the Church of England."

And he further says that—

> "The attitude of these extreme men is becoming a source of irritation and danger, and inflicting untold injury to morality and religion. If by a simple and inexpensive process the clergy who are seeking to Romanise the Church of England could be deprived of their benefices, the evils now so much deplored by a great majority of the clergy and laity of the Church of England would be removed."

That is the Bishop's charge.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman's interruption greatly strengthens my argument, as he knows. My argument was that we all want to get rid of these extreme practices. The allegations of the supporters of the Bill are that the way to get rid of these practices is to abolish the veto. It is said that the veto is used to prevent prosecutions, but evidence is not given to show that prosecutions were sought to be initiated. There was a sentence which fell from my hon. friend in his opening speech with which I have perfect agreement. He said that it is a question of the spirit rather than of the letter of the law. So it is. You will never manage a question of spirit by merely strengthening your legal machinery. I put it to my hon. friend and to the House whether it really is simply a desire to see that every minute particular of the rubrics of the Church is followed in practices of this kind, or whether it is not a much deeper and stronger feeling—namely, the fear that these rubrics are being used in a direction which would destroy the reformed character of the Church of England, and which justly frightens and alarms many people who are essentially Protestant. It is not a question of law simply, or of the law being kept or not; it is a question whether the law is being twisted for ulterior objects. If that is so, if it is a question rather of the spirit than of the letter, how will the mere dealing with the letter make it right? And may I emphasise this point by an illustration? Let us suppose two parishes side by side, one occupied by a gentleman of what are called advanced views, and the other occupied by a gentleman of more moderate views. And let us ask how this Bill, if passed, would affect the condition of those two parishes in the circumstances which I am going to explain to the House. Let us suppose that the clergyman of moderate views broke the rubric in some relatively unimportant detail. Let us suppose he did not read the Litany on Sunday. That is undoubtedly an ecclesiastical offence. If passions ran high, and the two parties in the Church were going to set to work to fight each other in the law Courts, he might be, and possibly would be, prosecuted for this offence. The right hon. Gentleman says that might be stopped by the Court on the ground that it was frivolous and vexatious. The right hon. Gentleman is mistaken in that. It is a distinct and undoubted breach of ecclesiastical law, and no Court could stop the prosecution on the ground that it was frivolous or vexatious. This clergyman whose case I am supposing, is maliciously prosecuted, and is put to great cost and inconvenience by that prosecution. The mere fact that he admitted he had committed a breach of the rubric technically, and said the rubric ought to be followed, and that in future he would read the Litany every Sunday morning, would not save him. He would have to go before the Court, and to bear all the expense incidental under our present precious system of law to being brought before a Court.

Now, I will take the case of his neighbour. When the Bill is passed, his neighbour sets to work and says, "Now they are going to fight us by means of actions at law, how far can I carry out my anti-Protestant policy without coming into conflict with the law?" As far as I can see, it would be in his power to do some of the things which I, at all events, most strongly object to. He might, and he probably would, in his expositions of doctrine, use words which could not be taken hold of or brought before the tribunal, which went beyond the sacramental doctrine of the Church of England, and which, at all events, had the effect of educating his congregation in another and very different doctrine. He might persuade his congregation to be present during the Communion service without participating in it, so long as three communicants did receive the Communion. He might induce all the parents whom he could influence to bring their children to the ceremony. He might use incense non-ceremonially. There are nice distinctions between what are ceremonial uses and what are not ceremonial uses, and it would be extremely difficult for a Court of law to catch him out. He might — and this is worst of all, I think—by teaching, by precept, and by personal influence, encourage the utmost practice of confession. Which of these two men carries out the spirit which my hon. friend desires to see—the man whom you prosecute, or the man whom you cannot prosecute; the man whom the machinery of the law—if you deprive the Bishops of their veto—would enable any man maliciously to haul before a tribunal, or the man who sets his whole wits to work to get round the law of the Church of England?

When you are dealing with the spirit, to the spirit you must go; and it is only a spiritual authority which can do anything, in my judgment, effectually to keep the Church of England within the great traditional lines that have ever been before her. And remember this Bill deprives the Bishops of their natural and legitimate functions. How are you going to ask the Bishops to exercise that persuasive and paternal influence over the clergymen I have described if this House says it is not a matter for the Bishops, it is not a matter for the Archbishops: it is a matter for the common informer supported by the funds of this or that High Church or Low Church organisation? My hon. friend has made an eloquent plea for the better representation of the laity and for increased power of the laity in managing the affairs of the Church. My hon. friend has my sympathy; but, speaking as a layman, I say, at all events so far as I am concerned, I deny that I am properly represented by the common informer. I have always said publicly in this House, and I have always thought, that there ought to be such a reform of our ecclesiastical organisation as would give the laymen a legitimate place in their counsels. That legitimate place surely is not given by handing over to informers in a Court of law the work which should be done by the Bishops, by the clergy, by the laity of the Church. I do not mean to occupy the time of the House more than to say this: I do not know what the future of the Church is going to be; I look upon it with the utmost anxiety. But I am perfectly certain of two things—in the first place, that we must put down these illegal practices, and, in the second place, we must deal with them in a manner which shall not alienate a great body of opinion absolutely loyal to the Church with whom we differ, and who really dislike these practices as much as we do. Having laid down that proposition, with which I am convinced even my hon. friend will agree, let me ask whether an attempt at legislation upon these lines is the best way of helping the authorities of the Church to carry out the great and difficult duties entrusted to them. We have a new Archbishop; an Archbishop who has been in office but a few weeks; an Archbishop in whom I believe the whole country has the utmost confidence; an Archbishop who has made no secret of his views upon these subjects. Are you really going to say that in the very first month of his tenure of the Archbishop's throne you are going to carry out a policy which makes the episcopal function almost a superfluity, and which will carry division and ruin, as I believe, into the organised ranks of the Church? I think it would be a most cruel thing to do. I agree that if in the last five years no progress had been made, if the earnest protest of this House in 1899 had remained fruitless and without effect, then perhaps it would have been necessary for us to plunge immediately into this great controversy. Sir, less has been done than I hoped, less has been done than I think perhaps we had a right to expect. But much has been done, more than can be shown by any of those lists of statistics scattered so freely abroad, which every man who has an opportunity of closely watching the life of the Church will be ready to accept and to welcome. And while I admit that is to the good, I have also to admit that I do think the present circumstances are of such a character that the question cannot be put on one side, or ought not to be put on one side, by earnest Churchmen without an attempt to find some machinery by which the processes of maintaining the law of the Church should be rendered easier and should be rendered more effectual. I could have wished that this Bill, and the Bill which we have also been discussing informally during the progress of this debate, could have been referred to a Select Committee of this House, and that in a cooler atmosphere and in circumstances more congenial to critical examination some effort should have been made to devise a scheme, not open to the objections to which I have referred, to lay before the House. I understand that the authors of this Bill repudiate that course, and it is in their power to defeat it. Had they been willing to accept it, I, for my own part, would gladly have allowed this Bill to go to the Second Reading, on condition that my hon. friend's Bill also went to a Second Reading, and that both were sent to a Select Committee upstairs. But, as I understand, the promoters of this Bill are unalterably opposed to that course, which, I believe, would have been best in their interests, in the interests of the Church, and in the still greater and wider interests of religion. I cannot reconcile it with my conscience to give any support to the Second Reading of this Bill so long as it stands alone as the one policy recommended to this House; and with the utmost reluctance, and yet believing that I am doing the best for the very cause which my hon. friend and I have at heart, I shall feel bound to oppose it.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put," but MR. SPEAKER withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.

Debate resumed.

MR. STOCK (Liverpool, Walton) said he deplored and detested the action of certain clergymen who put the laws of the Church of England at defiance, but as a Churchman, and a Low Churchman, he could not view with entire approval the Bill under consideration, and on two broad grounds. First, because he thought that a question of this kind, affecting as it did the national Church, and therefore almost every class in the community, was surely a national question. Consequently, he was of opinion that a Bill of this kind, if necessary—and he believed that it was necessary—ought to be introduced by a responsible Minister of the Crown rather than by a private Member. Second, because he could not believe that any mere section of the Church would ever be allowed to legislate for the Church at large. It was his firm conviction that any legislation in regard to Church discipline to be of lasting good—and that was what the laity desired—ought to be some large and comprehensive measure which every Churchman of all shades of opinion could support, and ought only to be introduced by the Government of the day. He contended that a reform of this kind must come from within the Church, as well as from without it, in order to work smoothly and effectually. For these reasons he deeply regretted that the Government had not seen fit to bring in further legislation to enforce the existing laws of the realm. He frankly admitted what the Prime Minister had stated, that the Bishops and the Archbishops had done much more in the way of checking abuses than had caught the public eye. He had always had great sympathy and respect for all creeds and all forms of religion, but he had absolutely no respect or sympathy with those Churchmen who deliberately broke their ordination vows and still remained in the Church of England. Although he would have preferred that the two Bills should be referred to a Select Committee, he was obliged to support the Second Reading of this Bill, because it was his sincere conviction, and the sincere conviction of his constituents, that some legislation was urgently needed to cause this lawlessness in the Church to cease. Simply as a protest, and without committing himself to the machinery of the Bill, and reserving full liberty of action on the Committee Stage, he gave his support to the Motion for the Second Reading.

Mr. WHITE RIDLEY (Stalybridge): If the debate has no other result, it will afford the House the satisfaction of knowing that perhaps for the first time everybody of all shades of religious opinion is united in agreeing that the state of affairs in the Church is serious, whether we are Extreme High Churchmen, Extreme Low Churchmen, or Moderate Churchmen. I for one, however, go further, and say that whatever we may do to-day, whether we pass this or any other Bill, it will not effectually stop the action of which we disapprove. It is not by passing a law in this House that we shall put an end to these practices. The real solution of this question lies in the hearts of the people, and in their willingness and determination that the laws of the Church shall be observed. I think, nevertheless, it is most important that Parliament should take notice of this matter to-day, and that it should, as a protest against the state of affairs which undoubtedly exists in the Church at the present time, pass the Second Reading of this Bill. At the same time, though my name appears on the back of the measure, I very much regret that my hon. friends have seen fit to refuse a Second Reading to the Bill of the hon. and learned Member for Stretford. It seems to me the proper course—the course which would have ensured the most unanimity—would have been to have referred both these Bills to a Select Committee. There is nothing in either of the Bills so inconsistent with the other as to place it beyond the power of a Select Committee to unify them and produce a Bill which may secure the unanimous approval of every Member of the House.

Sir SAMUEL HOARE (Norwich): One of the unfortunate necessities of a Bill of this importance being discussed at so short a sitting is that it renders it impossible for all who would like to take part in the debate to put their views forward, and to state why they are going to take the course they intend to take in the Division. I trust I may, however, be allowed to supplement the able remarks of the Prime Minister, and to add my humble words to the appeal which he has made to the promoters of this Bill, and to the House in general, that the two Bills before the House shall be considered together. The Bill now under discussion has been alluded to in some quarters as not an honest Bill. I say at once I think it is one of the most honest Bills that has ever been brought before the House, and we are indebted to the promoters for the clear way in which they have put forward their case. We all more or less share in the object of the Bill. We realise that there are grave matters to be dealt with, and we are prepared—even those of us who have been opposed to legislation in the past, to consider legislation now. But if an Act of Parliament is to be passed by this House, it must be passed not as it were aiming at one section or another of the Church, it must be passed in such a manner and with such force that there will be general confidence in it by the whole Church when it has been enacted. Will that be the case if the Bill before the House to-day receives a Second Reading and is passed into law? I feel confident it will not. I feel very much it will aggravate the very difficulties which we are anxious to remedy. I fear it will make matters worse, and so as a humble but loyal member of the Church I will ask the promoters whether they are not willing to allow both Bills to be considered by a Committee upstairs. All sections of the Church, if I may say so, are much nearer to-day than they were in 1895. The Bill which has been brought forward by the hon. Member for Liverpool is much less drastic and much simpler than the Bill of 1895, when there were many in this House who like myself believed that legislation would not carry out what we required, and therefore voted against it. But to-day we are ready for legislation, if we can be assured that it will, when carried, be of such a character as to command the confidence of the Church.

I should be glad if to-day the members of the Church in this House could do away with those divisions which are weakening the power of the Church at the present time. Cannot we unite in action to secure an object on the desirability of which we are agreed? It seems to me that agreement is very near and very close. Cannot the laity speak out on this important and serious question? Cannot we show that while we are determined that there shall be discipline in the Church we at the same time realise that with addition to discipline on the part of the clergy there must also be loyalty on the part of the laity? We have a heavy responsibility on us in reference to this matter. It is not possible to settle a question such as this on a Friday afternoon; it can only be settled by the mature deliberations of a Committee upstairs, and I therefore implore the promoters of the Bill and the House generally to say, "If we do pass this measure, let it be complete; let it be one that will be accepted by the Church at large, let it be one which will further the work of our great Church and make it more effective in its religious, social and philanthropic work, not only for the sake of the Church, but for the sake also of the nation."

COLONEL SANDYS (Lancashire, Bootle): Time is very short, and I will therefore only say a few words. I feel on an occasion of this kind that it is incumbent on me to state my reasons for the vote I am about to give. May I draw attention to the statement of the Prime Minister with regard to the liability which would be incurred by the Bishops for the expense of prosecutions inaugurated by them? I desire to point out that in the event of a Bishop allowing a layman to go forward with his case, not a single shilling of the expense would fall on the Bishop himself; and therefore his best way out of the difficulty will be for him to allow the case to go forward. I think I am justified in making this remark to the House because I think some misapprehension exists on that point. I have been assured by a high legal authority that the state of the law is as I have put it forward. The other point to which I wish to draw attention is this, that the suggestion that the two Bills should be read a second time and be sent to the Committee upstairs for calm consideration is one which commends itself to my judgment. Had the promoters of the Bill consulted me—and they did not do me that honour—I should certainly have recommended that course. But if it is not adopted, I shall vote in support of the Liverpool Bill, as, if properly and thoroughly carried out, it will go far to settle the present difficulty.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton): I desire very shortly to state that I agree entirely with what has fallen from my hon. friends. I came here prepared to support the second reading of the Liverpool Bill, as I believed my justification for that would be found in the fact that this House is representative of the laity and the guardian of their interests. The country has great expectations from the House on this question, and it will be sadly disappointed if our discussion to-day results in failure to take action. I have earnestly striven to help bring about the arrangements for sending these two Bills to a Select Committee, but if the first Bill only is read a second time and carried, then I fear more harm than good may be done. Although I wish most earnestly to do so, I cannot give my support to this Bill unless the arrangement I have referred to is acted upon, for I believe that in the second Bill there may be found means for restoring order to the Church and bringing about the results we all so much desire. Very hard words have been spoken about the Bishops. We regard them as responsible for the discipline of the Church in the same way as we regard a commanding officer as responsible for the discipline of his regiment. If he does not enforce that discipline he is removed. But we expect the Bishops to do this work when they have not the power to enforce their commands. I think the Bill of my hon. and learned friend the Member for the Stretford Division would do much to remove that difficulty. It is conceived in a fair spirit; it is capable of alteration and amendment so as to meet the difficulties suggested on the other side, and I therefore earnestly hope that even now, at the last moment, the promoters of the Liverpool Bill will consent to the adoption of the course which has been suggested.

Mr. SEELY (Lincoln): I rise to express my regret that the promoters of the Bill have not seen their way to accept the proposals which have been made to them to have both Bills sent to a Select Committee. They are losing a great opportunity. Those who, like myself, are very keenly interested in the Protestant character of the Church of England, hold that there is undoubtedly at the present time a certain amount of risk of injury to that Protestant character on account of the foolish action of certain clergymen belonging to it, and therefore we ought not to lose any opportunity of making arrangements by which such evils may be obviated. We have two Bills before us to-day; each contains good provisions. The Bill under discussion has its virtues, but it has also one fatal fault, in that it hands over religious questions to the uncontrolled mercy of the common informer. I have always thought the common informer to be about the worst product of modern civilisation, and I am not willing to consent to leave the Clergy of the Church of England at his mercy without the provision of proper safeguards.

The Bill of the hon. and learned Member for Stretford possesses the virtue that it increases the power of the Bishops, a power which, as all who are acquainted with this question will acknowledge, largely requires strengthening. But that provision too has a fatal fault in that it interferes with the power of the civil Courts of the realm. Therefore it seems to me that to take these two Bills together and to send them to a Committee upstairs would have been a statesmanlike thing to do; worthy of the House and its Members who, although during elections take keen views on one side or the other, are, when they reach here, representative of the whole of their constituents, and should do their best to allay rather than increase ill-feeling. I hope that even at this eleventh hour the promoters of this Bill will take a statesmanlike course. If they do not, I shall feel it my duty to vote against them, although I am at one with them in the main object they seek to attain.

Sir JOHN DORINGTON (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): I had the honour a few days ago of waiting with a large number of Members of Parliament on the Archbishops on the question of Church Discipline, our view being that some alteration of the law was needed to deal with a condition of things which was far from satisfactory. We felt that legislation would not provide the sole cure for the trouble, but that if the Bishops had not sufficient power we ought to try and give it to them.

Mr. BRAND (Cambridgeshire, Wisbech): I beg to move that the Question be now put.

*MR. SPEAKER: Unless the right hon. baronet proposes to talk the Bill out, I shall not accept that Motion.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON: I have not that intention. I only wish to say that in the proposal of the hon. Member for the Stretford Division I believe the solution most acceptable to moderate Churchmen is to be found.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 190; Noes, 139. (Division List No. 33.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)
Allen, Chas. P. (*Glos., Stroud*)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbt. Hy.
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Barlow, John Emmott
Bell, Richard
Bignold, Arthur
Blake, Edward
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, Sir Alx. H. (*Shropsh.*)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, Rt Hn J A (*Glasg.*)
Campbell, John (*Armagh, S.*)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cawley, Frederick
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Channing, Francis Allston
Charrington, Spencer
Collings, Right Hon. Jesse
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasgow*)
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Craig, Robert Hunter (*Lanark*
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cross, H. Shepherd (*Bolton*)
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (*Carmarthen*)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (*Cardign*
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Douglas, Charles M. (*Lanark*)
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (*Leith*
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Furness, Sir Christopher
Galloway, William Johnson
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Gordon, J. (*Londonderry, S.*)
Grant, Corrie

Gray, Ernest (*West Ham*)
Greene, Hy. D. (*Shrewsbury*)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robt. Wm.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt Hon Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H (*Bristol, E.*
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (*Midd., Tott'ham*
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnstone, Heywood
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David B. (*Swansea*)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Knowles, Lees
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawrence, Wm. F. (*Liverpool*
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lee, A. H. (*Hants, Fareham*)
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (*Accrington*)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lockie, John
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (*Evesham*
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Lucas, Col. Francis (*Lowestoft*
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (*Liverpool*)
M'Arthur, William (*Cornwall*)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Manners, Lord Cecil
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Morgan, J. Lloyd (*Carmarthen*
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newdegate, Francis A. N.

Newnes, Sir George
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer, Sir C. M. (*Durham*)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pemberton, John S. G.
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Price, Robert John
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, James (*Greenock*)
Ridley, Hon. H. W. (*Stalybridge*
Roberts, John H. (*Denbighs.*)
Roberts, Samuel (*Sheffield*)
Robertson, Edmund (*Dundee*)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rose, Charles Day
Rutherford, W. W. (*Liverpool*)
Samuel, Herbt. L. (*Cleveland*)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Shaw, Charles E. (*Stafford*)
Shaw, Thomas (*Hawick, B.*)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (*Forfarshire*)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (*Flint*)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (*Northants*
Spencer, Sir E. (*W. Bromwich*)
Stanley, Hon. A. (*Ormskirk*)
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Stock, James Henry
Strachey, Sir Edward
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (*Glam., E.*)
Thomas, David A. (*Merthyr*)
Thomas, F. Freeman- (*Hastings*
Thomson, F. W. (*York, W. R.*)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. E. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H. (*Sheffield*
Walker, Col. William Hall

Wallace, Robert
Walton, J. Lawson (*Leeds, S.*)
Walton, Joseph (*Barnsley*)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Wason, E. (*Clackmannan*)
Wason, J. Cathcart (*Orkney*)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (*York, E. R.*)
Whiteley, G. (*York, W. R.*)
Whiteley, H.(*Ashton-u.-Lyne*)
Whitley, J. H. (*Halifax*)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams. RtHnJ Powell-(Birm
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, H. J. (*York, W. R.*)
Wilson, John (*Glasgow*)
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Austin Taylor and
Mr. Brand.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Aug. Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther, H. T.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bailey, James (*Walworth*)
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (*Manch'r*
Balfour, RtHnGerald W. (*Leeds*
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benj.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (*Middx.*)
Bull, William James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, V C W (*Derbysh.*)
Cecil, Evelyn (*Aston Manor*)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (*Greenwich*)
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Colston, Chas. Edw H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Delany, William
Dewar, Sir T. R. (*Tr. Haml'ts*
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duke, Henry Edward
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, HnA.G.H(*City of Lond*
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (*St. Albans*
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Graham, Henry Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld. G. (*Midx*
Hardy, Laurence (*Kent, Ashfd*
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, RtHnH (*Somrst E*
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, Jno (*Kent, Faver'hm*
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Joyce, Michael
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (*Denbigh*
Keswick, William
Law, H. Alex. (*Donegal, W.*)
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (*Monm'th*)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (*Shropshire*)
Morgan, D. J. (*Walthamstow*)
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robt. Gray C.
Murphy, John
Myers, William Henry
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Brien, P. J. *Tipperary, N.*)
Palmer, Walter (*Salisbury*)
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Reddy, M.
Remnant, Jas. Farquharson
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. F. (*Bethnal Green*)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson
Robertson, H. (*Hackney*)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Scott, Sir S. (*Marylebone, W.*)
Seely, Chas. Hilton (*Lincoln*)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (*Renfrew*)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, Jas. Parker (*Lanarks.*)
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (*Strand*)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (*Somerset*)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, RtHnJ.G.(*Oxf'rd Univ.*
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE. (*Taunton*
Wharton, Rt. Hon. J. Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (*Yorks.*)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (*Bath*)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Francis Powell and
Sir James Fergusson.

Bill accordingly read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

First Report brought up, and read; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 74.]

CIVIL SERVICE (EXCESS), 1901-2.

Copy presented, of Statement of the Sum required to be voted in order to make good an Excess on the Grant for National Gallery of Ireland for the year ended 31st March 1902 [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 75.]

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 16th March, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—

Birmingham District Tramways [H.L.].
Hove, Worthing, and District Tramways [H.L.].
South Staffordshire Tramways [H.L.].
North Cheshire Tramways [H.L.].
Dewsbury, Batley, and Birstal Tramways [H.L.].

And also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with:—
Jewish Colonisation Association—(Petition for Bill).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

South Staffordshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Hove, Worthing, and District Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Chatham and District Light Railways Bill [H.L.]; Mid Yorkshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Shepshed Urban District Gas Bill [H.L.]; South Lancashire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Preston and Horwich Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Southern Tramways (Lancashire) Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Southern Tramways (Cheshire) Bill [H.L.]; Derby Gas Bill [H.L.]; read 2ª.

Manchester Corporation Bill [H.L.]; North Cheshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; read 2ª (according to order).

North-Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill [H.L.]; Standing Order No. 92, considered (according to order), and dispensed with, with respect to a Petition of the Promoters of the Shropshire, Worcestershire, and East Denbighshire Electric Power Bill. Leave given to present the said Petition.

Macclesfield and District Electric Tramways Bill [H.L.]; to be read 2ª on Monday next.

Didcot, Newbury, and Southampton Railway Bill [H.L.]; North's Navigation Collieries Bill [H.L.]; King's College, London, Bill [H.L.]; committed.

Harrow and Stanmore Gas Bill [H.L.]; Taff Vale Railway Bill [H.L.]; London and North-Western Railway Bill [H.L]; Birmingham Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Brighton Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Exeter Corporation Bill [H.L.]; committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS.

Annual Series: No. 2943. Russi (Odessa) (supplementary).

PHYSICAL TRAINING (SCOTLAND).

Report of the Royal Commission on Physical Training (Scotland).

Vol. I. Report and appendix.

Vol. II. Minutes of evidence and index.

Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS, 1853 TO 1891 (CONDITIONAL LICENCES).

Licence to be at large, granted by His Majesty to Rolla Richards, to which was annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule A of the Penal Servitude Act, 1864.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 AND 1896.

Three Orders, numbered 6,620, 6,621, and 6,633 respectively, relating to the landing of foreign animals in Great Britain.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

(1.) Special Exceptions (Meal Hours in Electrical Stations). Order dated 11th March, 1903, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 40 (4) of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, extending (subject to certain conditions) the special exceptions as to meal hours to young persons above the age of sixteen years employed in electrical stations.

(2.) Special Exception (Night Work at Electrical Stations). Order, dated 11th March, 1903, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 54 (4) of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, extending the special exception under that section (subject to certain conditions) to the employment at night in electrical stations of male young persons of the age of sixteen and upwards.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILLS.

Ordered,

That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Thursday, the 18th day of June next.

That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill originating in this House shall be read a first time after Tuesday, the 5th day of May next.

That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Thursday, the 18th day of June next.

That when a Bill shall have passed this House with Amendments, these orders shall not apply to any new Bill sent up from the House of Commons which the Chairman of Committees shall report to the House is substantially the same as the Bill so amended.

That this House will not receive any petition for a Private Bill later than Tuesday, the 5th day of May next, unless such Private Bill shall have been approved by the High Court of Justice; nor any petition for a Private Bill approved by the High Court of Justice after Friday, the 8th day of May next.

That this House will not receive any report from the Judges upon petitions presented to this House for Private Bills after Friday the 8th day of May next.

Ordered, That the said orders be printed and published, and affixed on the doors of this House and Westminster Hall. [No. 15.]

ARMY (VOLUNTEER RIFLE RANGES).

*THE EARL OF DARTMOUTH: My Lords, I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he is now in a position to lay on the Table the Papers promised by his predecessor on 17th May, 1901,† giving the details of the manner in which the £170,000, allocated for Volunteer ranges in the years 1900–1901, has been distributed; and to move for a return of the Papers. I have asked this question because I think it will be interesting to those who take part in the Volunteer movement to know exactly what is being done with the sum that was set aside for their assistance in the matter of rifle ranges some little time ago. It may be in the recollection of your Lordships that in the year 1900 I asked a question on this subject,‡ and I was informed that £40,000 had been allocated for, as I understood then, the assistance of those battalions whose ranges had been compulsorily closed. I asked a further question on the same subject in May, 1901,§ and was then informed that a total sum of £170,000 had been allocated, I think, out of the Military Works Loans Act for this purpose. At that time, £77,000 had been distributed, and the balance—£93,000—remained to be dealt with; and I hope the noble Earl will be able to tell us to-night how much of that £93,000 still remains to be dealt with, and that he will promise to circulate Papers which will give a detailed account of the manner in which the whole sum has been allocated. I make no apology for having asked the question, as it seems to me that at the present time this is a very important subject to Volunteers generally, because, if our Volunteer forces are to form, as I understand they are to form, an integral part, and a very important integral part, of our home defence, it is essential that they should be in a position to make themselves thoroughly efficient in the matter of rifle shooting. If we can get this information, we shall then be able to form an opinion as to what will be required in the future, and I have no doubt that the noble Earl will be willing to give this information, and also to allow the Papers, for which I move, to be presented to the House.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, xciv., 422.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, lxxix., 443.

§ See (4) *Debates*, xciv., 442.

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for Papers giving the details of the manner in which the £170,000 allocated for Volunteer ranges in the years 1900–1901 has been distributed."—(*The Earl of Dartmouth.*)

THE MARQUESS OF HUNTLY: My Lords, before the Under Secretary replies to the noble Earl opposite, may I be permitted to ask a question of which I have given him private notice? I should like some further information than that which has been asked for by the noble Earl who has just sat down—namely, whether any further help beyond these grants can be given to Volunteers to enable them to acquire rifle ranges? To show the position in which a great many Volunteer Corps are placed at the present moment, I will state a case which has occurred in my own neighbourhood. A battalion in North Northamptonshire were turned out of their range in the neighbourhood of Peterborough, and after looking round the district for a long time they found a suitable spot for a new range on my property. They applied to me for leave to have the range made on this land, and, although I must say that, personally, I regarded it as rather a nuisance, I did not think it right to stand in the way of the Volunteers getting the range. I went to the War Office to make inquiry and found that the grant which would be given would be about one-third of the cost of constructing the butts and fitting out the range. This battalion—and I believe most Volunteer battalions in the country are in the same position—is labouring in "Short Street," and the finding of two-thirds of the cost of the range is a very serious drain on its resources. But still, the commanding officer thought he would face the difficulty and try and raise money by means of bazaars and the like, or by subscription. With great difficulty I got the tenants who farmed the land where the range was to be made to agree to allow the range to be constructed; it was passed by the War Office, and we thought that all the difficulties were overcome; but I am sorry to say that some of the tenants in the neighbourhood—one of them a gentleman occupying a residential house within about half-a-mile of the proposed range—took a very strong line of action. The particular gentleman to whom I refer wrote to say that if the range was sanctioned he would give up his house. The question arises whether a valuable tenant should be kept, or whether one should be public-spirited enough, having given the land for a range, to also lose a tenant paying a high rent in consequence. I mention that to show the difficulties facing private owners in trying to meet the wishes of Volunteer corps.

In my opinion these essential requirements for Volunteers can only be provided by the War Office itself in each locality, constructing a range where the Volunteers in that district can learn to shoot. It is almost impossible, if it is left to private owners, for the latter to surmount the extreme difficulties which they have to meet. Rightly or wrongly, there are enormous objections on the part of residents to the continual firing every Saturday in the summer, at these rifle ranges, and some people consider it such a nuisance that they say they will leave the neighbourhood rather than allow the range to be constructed. There are on the sea coast and in the fens of England places which could be easily acquired where there are few inhabitants, and where this inconvenience would not be so great; but the work must be carried out by the War Office, and for that reason I wish to ask the noble Earl whether, looking to the great public importance of this question—for unless you get rifle ranges for the Volunteers I am certain you will not keep the force together—the War Office cannot go further than it has, and not merely give one-third towards the cost, but itself provide ranges in each neighbourhood for the local battalions.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of HARDWICKE): My Lords, in reply to the noble Earl behind me I have to say that the War Office have no objection to laying the Papers on the Table that he desires to see laid. I am sorry, however, that I am unable to tell him that the Papers can be laid at once. The £170,000 set aside in 1901 for the purpose of assisting Volunteer corps to acquire ranges was placed in the hands of a Committee of the War Office called the Rifle Range Committee. This

Committee considered applications from various Volunteer corps who were anxious to obtain ranges, and in allocating grants they decided that only half of the amount that the range was going to cost, or such smaller amount as the Committee might think sufficient in the special circumstances of the case, should be given. It was also agreed that no money should be paid over until the range was completed. The position at present is as follows. Money has been allocated to nineteen Artillery corps, three Engineer corps, and 154 Volunteer corps, their ranges having been completed. There are many other corps who have had money allocated to them, but have either found it unnecessary to make use of that money, or have not yet completed the work of constructing the ranges. It has also happened that in many instances the estimated amount that the range was going to cost has, on the completion of the work, turned out to be less, and therefore a certain sum has come back to the Committee which they will be able to allocate to other Volunteer corps in the future. At the present moment the Committee have in their hands a sum of about £13,000, and they are now purposing to allocate that amount to other Volunteer corps. I think I can confidently state that in the course of this session we shall be able to lay full returns on the Table of the House showing the manner in which this money has been spent. I hope this statement will satisfy the noble Earl, and that he will be content to withdraw the Motion for Papers to be laid at once.

The noble Marquess opposite has stated a case which I am sure has the full sympathy of myself and others connected with this matter at the War Office, but I must point out to him that one of the Volunteer regulations is that corps shall provide themselves with ranges, and no Volunteer corps is allowed to be formed unless it is able to state that it has a range. Of course, we recognise that that has proved very hard on the Volunteers as a whole, and this £170,000 was provided in the Estimates to assist regiments to acquire ranges. I think I have shown the House that we have been able to assist a very large number of regiments, and if the special case to which the noble Marquess referred is a hard one, I can only express the regret of the Secretary of State, and the hope that out of the sum of money that we have been able to save by other ranges not having cost so much as was anticipated, we shall be able to assist in some manner that particular case.

*EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I only wish to say a word with regard to the case which the noble Marquess has brought up of the Northamptonshire range. The noble Earl, in the statement he has just made, declared that a rifle corps had to find a range for itself, and he rather implied that it would not be sanctioned unless it had secured a range; but I would point out that the range to which the noble Marquess referred was one belonging to a corps which has been established for many years. They had an admirable range in use close to Milton Park, and when the new regulations with regard to the greater length of the range, consequent upon the new rifle, came into force this, with several other ranges in Northamptonshire, was closed, and it became a matter of extreme difficulty to secure another range. Whether, if the War Office found a range by the sea, as the noble Marquess had hinted, that would help the Northamptonshire corps I do not know; but I very much doubt it. I do, however, plead that an old corps, which had an admirable range before the changed circumstances of the Army made it necessary that it should be closed, should receive more consideration than one that has not found a range. I therefore hope that more assistance will be given to this very excellent corps, which, by the way, was in my regiment, and that facilities will be afforded it for shooting, in which it was formerly so distinguished. I know that was so, because I had the honour of taking many men from that corps to shoot in rifle matches. I hope the War Office will favourably consider this claim, and other claims like it, and possibly give larger assistance than they have done hitherto.

*THE EARL OF DARTMOUTH: The noble Earl the Under Secretary has asked me to withdraw my Motion for Papers to be laid immediately. I did not suggest that they should be laid at once. I have waited with exemplary patience for a year and ten months, all but a day, and, therefore, I can wait a little longer. I certainly do not wish to press him to lay the Papers on the Table before they are ready, but I would like to ask the noble Earl this question: Why is it necessary to wait till the whole sum has been allocated before laying the Papers on the Table? There is only a sum of £13,000 left to allocate, and surely there can be no great objection to laying Papers before Parliament, at all events in regard to the money already distributed. It seems to me unnecessary to wait till the whole sum has been spent, and I should be glad if the noble Earl could let us have a return of the money already spent. With regard to one other point, I think the noble Earl said that half the amount that the range was going to cost was the amount allocated to individual corps.

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE: The most that was allocated.

*THE EARL OF DARTMOUTH: Yes, but from my own personal experience, in some instances at any rate, only half has been given of the amount raised by the battalion itself, apart from individual subscriptions, which is a very different thing indeed from giving half the total amount. In many instances the locality is asked to assist, and they do what they can very gladly; and, after having exhausted the locality, to be only given by the War Office assistance to the extent of half the amount raised by the battalion itself is, in my opinion, not nearly a sufficient grant to enable the corps to properly equip a rifle range.

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE: In reply to the further question of the noble Earl behind me, the reason I did not specify that we should be able to lay Papers at once, was simply that every Volunteer corps was informed that its accounts must be sent into the War Office and settled by June 30th next. Therefore I thought that early in July I should be able to present a full and complete statement to the House. The £13,000 is the actual amount we have in hand at present, but it is quite possible that within the course of the next few months we may be able to save more. Suppose, for instance, the estimated cost of a range was £2,000 and we had agreed to allocate £800, and that on the completion of the range its cost proved to be only £1,000. In that case we should only grant £400, and thereby save £400 which would be added to the £13,000. If the noble Earl presses for it I can lay a statement on the Table, but I do not think it would be altogether a satisfactory one, as it would be subject to revision in the course, possibly, of the next few weeks. I think that a satisfactory return could be placed on the Table in the course of the month of July. In reply to the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition I would point out that the range to which the noble Marquess has referred has already received a grant from this Committee of one third of the cost, and no corps has received a larger grant than one half of the cost.

THE MARQUESS OF HUNTLY: It has not received any grant at all. The noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition was quite correct when he said that the corps had a range close to Milton Park, and that it was closed by order of the War Office. It has been looking about for a range ever since. I believe it has had an offer from the War Office of a third of the cost, but it cannot get the necessary sanction to enable it to obtain a range.

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE: I misunderstood the noble Marquess. I take it that a grant has been promised of one-third of the cost if the corps can find a range. I am sorry I cannot say that the War Office recognises it as a duty devolving upon them to find ranges; that is contrary to the regulations.

*THE EARL OF DARTMOUTH: I withdraw my Motion on the understanding that, if Papers are not laid on the Table by August 1, I shall raise the question again.

LIGHT LOCOMOTIVES (IRELAND) BILL.

(SECOND READING).

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (The Marquess of LONDONDERRY): My Lords, the object of the Bill which I am about to ask your Lordships to read a second time is to provide for the authorisation of races with light locomotives in Ireland. This measure has passed through its stages in the House of Commons supported by all shades of political and religious opinion, and therefore I feel that it would be superfluous for me to say more than a very few words in asking your Lordships to accord the Bill a Second Reading. I may say, however, that I have spoken to the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition with regard to the Bill, and that he has assured me that it will have his entire support. Your Lordships may be aware that during the past two years there have taken place in Germany and France automobile races for prizes given by Mr. Gordon Bennett, and they have been attended with the most complete success. The Automobile Club in this country have thought that it would be an advantage to accept the offer of Mr. Gordon Bennett, and that a motor car race should take place in Ireland. In order to ensure the possibility of that race taking place there, it was necessary for them to apply to Parliament to pass legislation which would prevent any contravention of those laws and regulations by which our roads and the traffic on those roads are governed. They have, therefore, submitted this Bill to you, and it is one which, to my mind, should not be opposed. It entrusts to the County Councils in Ireland the duty of making all the arrangements necessary in connection with these races, and it entrusts to them the whole responsibility for the safety of the public and for the stoppage of traffic which must necessarily take place in connection with races of this character; in fact, all the details incidental to the races are to be carried out by the County Councils. At the same time I would draw attention to the fact that the County Councils will incur no responsibility so far as charges are concerned, as the expenses incurred by a County Council in carrying any order under the Bill into effect, are to be defrayed by the Automobile Association, who are the applicants alluded to in the Bill. They will render every assistance in their power in co-operating with the County Councils in maintaining the necessary order, and in carrying out the necessary regulations of traffic which such a race will entail.

As one connected with Ireland—and I think I can appeal for support to two noble Earls opposite who have been Lords Lieutenant of that country—I feel confident that this measure will be of enormous value to Ireland. The races will attract people from all parts of the world. They will attract many from Europe who witnessed these races on the Continent, and I am told that they will even draw people from America to Ireland. Ireland is a poor country, and the incursion of vast numbers of people from abroad will mean a great pecuniary advantage to that country. I go further—and hope it will result in a great number of people from this country being attracted by motor car racing to make the acquaintance of Ireland, for, perhaps, the first time. I can assure them that they will receive the heartiest welcome from all Irishmen. Believing that the measure will be of great benefit to Ireland, I ask your Lordships to give it a Second Reading.

Moved that the Bill be now read 2^a.—(*The Marquess of Londonderry.*)

*EARL SPENCER: As the noble Marquess has alluded to me, I only rise to say that I heartily support the Bill now before the House, and I support it for the reasons which the noble Marquess has put forward. I confess it is very gratifying and a new sensation to me to find a Bill dealing with Ireland on which all sides, both in the other House and in this, are united.

THE MARQUESS OF GRANBY: Clause 1 provides that the County Councils may, on the application of any persons or club, by order declare that any roads within the county may be used for races with light locomotives and so on. I should like to ask the noble Marquess whether that applies solely to main roads, or whether it includes private roads? Is it merely a general term?

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: So far as I know, though I speak subject to correction, the whole matter is to be left to the County Councils, and therefore the races would be on county kept roads; but there are several Amendments to be moved in Committee, and if my noble friend has any doubt on the subject I shall be only too glad to deal with the matter then if, he will place an Amendment on the Paper. I propose to take the Committee stage on Friday.

On Question, Bill read 2^a (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

THE LICENSING QUESTION.

Lord BURTON: My Lords, I beg to ask the Lord Chancellor whether Magistrates in the discharge of their duties as licensing justices are not bound to be guided by the state of facts established before them in each case; and whether they are entitled to refuse the renewal of a licence to a licensed house in order to carry out a prearranged policy of reducing the number of licensed houses; and whether the hearing of an appeal to Quarter Sessions against the refusal to renew a licence is not a rehearing to which the above principles should apply.

I trust I may ask your Lordships' kind indulgence for a very few moments while I call attention to the present position of the licensing trade in this country. Until recently it has always been held, and the licensing justices have practically acted on that assumption, that so long as a licensed house was well-conducted the tenure of the licence was indisputable. Your Lordships are well aware that the goodwill of a licence is valued for the purpose of rating, and that it also has to be paid for in cases of compulsory purchase by railway companies and other public bodies. On the death of a lease-holder goodwill is charged, whereas without a licence there could be no goodwill, and on the death of a freeholder succession duty is charged on the assumption that the licence will endure during the whole life of the successor, and on the death of a mortgagee the whole nominal amount is assessed and duty paid thereon. If the licence does not hold good, if there is no goodwill in the licence, it is evident that the position of the second mortgagee must be absolutely worthless, and the position of the first very much deteriorated.

I would also call your Lordships' attention to the fact that as regards the pre-1869 beer houses, the position is unassailable, inasmuch as the licence cannot be taken away except for misconduct, and I think it is a fair inference to draw that when this privilege was granted to beer house licence-holders in 1869, it was not done out of any special favour to them, but because at that time it was the almost universal opinion of Parliament and the public generally that the position of full licence-holders was quite as favourable as, in fact was similar to, that which was then granted by Parliament to beer houses. But quite recently an entirely new position has been taken up by the licensing benches. It has always been held that the licensing justices were bound in their discretion to act judicially and according to knowledge derived from facts laid publicly before them. But now quite a new position has been taken up, and the licensing justices claim in many instances an absolutely unfettered discretion to deal with the property of licence-holders as they may think fit, without any regard whatever either to the conduct of the houses, their value, or their suitability—in other words, the licensing magistrates in many instances claim the right to confiscate the property of the licence-holders, which represents very often the savings of a lifetime, and the only means of livelihood that the holders possess, without any sort of compensation whatever, and without any reason assigned, more than that, in their opinion there are more licensed houses in the district than they think are required.

I would venture to point out to your Lordships that the value of a licence, that is to say the goodwill that attaches to it, as regards licensed property, may be roughly taken at an average of two-thirds or three-fourths of the selling value. Indeed, I am told that in some parts of London, apart from the City, the value is greater than that—something like four-fifths. Therefore, it is clear that to take away the licence from a property is practically to ruin the property and the owner of it. That the position as regards the licence-holder is a serious one I think the following facts will convince your Lordships. I have lately seen a summary of 700 reports or declarations recently made by benches of magistrates throughout the country, and I find that in more than 50 per cent. of them the justices state their intention next year to reduce the number of licences by refusing renewals. The *modus operandi*, as a rule, is that the owners are invited to make proposals for reductions, and failing this, the justices have threatened to take the matter into their own hands. Often a reduction of so many per cent. on the number of houses is suggested, going in some instances so far as one-third of the total number of houses, and if any hesitation is shown on the part of the holders, threats have been held out by the bench.

But the worst of it all is that there is no finality in this matter. There is no security that, when great and serious sacrifices have been made one year, other and more excessive ones will not be asked for the next. I observe in a letter in *The Times* that the chairman of a bench of magistrates in a well-known midland city speaks of insurance of licences as being a fit and proper manner of obtaining compensation. That is true up to a certain point, but only up to a certain and limited point. It has been possible to insure the value of licences, but that has only been because it has been understood that the licences would be renewed. But now that the renewal of licences is to depend only on the fancy, and on the very often hostile feeling, of the benches before whom they come, it may be certain that no insurance company will insure property which rests on such a precarious basis. Insurance companies, frightened at the present condition of affairs, have already increased their rates to an amount which it is almost impossible to accept. I trust that the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack will be able to give some assurance that in the future the licensing justices will be actuated not by mere fancy and caprice, but by considerations of facts and justice.

*THE LORD CHANCELLOR (the Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, before answering the terms of my noble friend's Question, there are two preliminary observations I should like to make. In the first place, considering the position I hold with regard to litigation that may come before this House, you will quite understand that I am simply answering an abstract question without reference to any particular case that may have occurred or that may occur. In the next place, I had no reason to suppose—until I heard what my noble friend had said, and I am greatly surprised to hear it—that magistrates generally had entered into any kind of resolution on the subject. I should deprecate that very much for this, among other reasons, that the question whether there should be compensation when any licence is taken away is one of considerable debate on both sides of politics; and if any bench of magistrates have identified themselves with a policy either one way or the other in respect of that matter, I should lament it for this reason, among others, that they have other and constant duties to perform, and I believe, notwithstanding what is sometimes said about them, that they perform those duties to the entire confidence of the country. I believe the country generally recognises the deep debt of gratitude it owes to the magistrates for the mode in which they perform their duty.

To the first part of the Question, I answer very distinctly that I do think magistrates are bound, in the discharge of their duties as licensing justices, to be guided by the state of facts established before them in each case; and I think if they were to proceed on some preliminary view of the policy that they ought to pursue, they would be exceeding their duty. I feel some hesitation in quoting my own views, which were expounded at some length in the well-known case of Sharpe *v.* Wakefield, in which I pointed out that the magistrates should proceed judicially—that is to say, not necessarily, as I pointed out in a subsequent case, by all the forms in which strictly judicial proceedings are guided, but that they must have regard to those principles of justice and the recognition of the rights of other people, which is the basis of the administration of justice in whatever court it is administered, and that they must not, to use the language of my noble friend, proceed capriciously or from mere fancy. In the case to which I have already referred, Lord Hannen points out very clearly what is the distinction between acting judicially and acting capriciously. He says—

> "Instances have been brought before the Courts where justices have expressed and acted upon a general intention with regard to all licences, whereas it is their duty to consider each individual case on its own special merits. The object of the 26th Section of the Act of 1874 appears to be to enforce this duty, and to require the justices to particularise the special ground on which they consider the personal attendance of the applicant necessary."

I think I may quote an instance in which Lord Selborne gave a very valuable judgment, where there was a general Act of Parliament prescribing the hours at which public-houses should be open. He pointed out that, although in that case the matter was left to the discretion of the magistrates, it must be a discretion applicable to a particular district and a particular case, and that a general resolution on their part was *ultra vires*—that they had no right to come to such a conclusion. His words are very pregnant and applicable to the present matter—

> "I cannot but think that their Lordships may have lost sight of a distinction which exists between the evasion of an Act of Parliament passed in derogation or restriction of the legal rights and liberties of the subject, and the evasion of an Act which confers for public purposes powers that would not otherwise exist. . . . Without meaning to deny that it is confided to the discretion of the magistrates to determine what particular localities require other powers for opening and closing than those specified, it is obvious that such discretion as they have is not an arbitrary discretion to define any localities they please, but they must be such localities as they consider, in the honest and *bonâ-fide* exercise of their own judgment, to require a difference to be made. The participle 'requiring' is connected with the substantive 'locality,' and therefore it must be a requirement arising out of the particular circumstances of the place."

Lord Cairns, in giving judgment in the same case (Macbeth *v.* Ashley, 1874), used very important words indeed. He said—

> "Now, my Lords, I will assume, though it is not for your Lordships now to decide, as the question has not arisen, that this may be a discretion which may be exercised more than once. That may be so, and upon that I express no opinion; but of this I am quite certain, that if magistrates, under the guise of exercising a discretion, had taken portion after portion of their district, not with reference to the particular wants or requirements of each portion, but in order by degrees to take possession of the whole district, and under the pretence of exercising a discretion for each portion, had virtually subverted the general rule laid down by the Legislature; if, I say, your Lordships were to find, which I cannot imagine or suppose you ever would find, the magistrates adopting that course for the purpose of doing what I must describe as evading an Act of Parliament, your Lordships would not be prepared to sanction, but would discountenance and prevent the exercise of a power so used."

It seems to me that in those observations may be found what is, I think, manifestly the law on that subject—that where you are exercising a discretion which the magistracy has had conferred upon it, you must in each case exercise the discretion, and not for any purpose, however praiseworthy, attempt to act the part of legislators instead of doing that which the Legislature requires you to do—act as judges in determining each particular case. How can the Legislature ever define the exact circumstances in which a licence is not to be granted? It would be impossible to define it. Therefore, you must leave it to the discretion of the justices, but the Legislature assumes that the discretion so given must be exercised judicially, and with reference to the real needs and requirements of the locality and conditions under which the licensed house is already held. It must be remembered—and it sometimes seems to be forgotten—that a licensed house can only have been licensed by the justices, and it would be an intolerable thing to suppose that although the justices themselves may be different—there may be different men on the bench, some may have passed away—they should oscillate backwards and forwards in their policy until there was nothing like continuity of policy in the body to which they belonged. Take the converse case. Supposing some of the justices were to suggest that it would be a better thing to have free trade in licences; supposing they came to the conclusion that it would be much better that anybody who applied for a licence should get one. Would anybody admit that that was an exercise of their discretion within the meaning of the statute? If such a resolution were arrived at on the other side beforehand, I think it would be equally beyond any discretion entrusted to the magistrates by the Legislature.

I may say with regard to another part of the Question that where you are dealing with the renewal of licences one has to be careful not to overstate the case on either side. It is perfectly true that the renewal of a licence is a new licence—new in the sense that magistrates have the same discretion in granting it for the next year that they had for the last year. That is a proposition which cannot be denied. The Legislature, I think, has assumed that there was a difference in the mode of dealing with the two cases, because it is in the Act of 1872 specially enacted that all applications for renewal of licences shall be dealt with by evidence given on oath. I read with very great satisfaction some observations made by my noble friend Lord Lindley when presiding at Petty Sessions. Speaking as the Chairman, he pointed out with great force, and in words in which I concur, the mode in which justices should approach this question. He said—

> "It is obviously much easier to determine whether it is desirable to grant or refuse a new licence than it is to determine whether to renew a licence already granted. It is true no owner or tenant of a public-house has a right to have his licence renewed, but the expectation that it will be renewed, unless there is good reason why it should not, is founded on human nature, and is perfectly reasonable, and cannot be ignored by any fair-dealing man. Outlays are made on the face of it, and the expectation gives a market value to the house which can be very closely estimated by persons accustomed to value such matters."

I think what the noble Lord has said in reference to the mode in which the Government treats these houses in exacting taxation adds much to Lord Lindley's observation that—

> "To refuse to renew a licence may be to inflict serious loss on the owner or tenant of the house, possibly on both, and no body of gentlemen can be expected to do this without coming to the conclusion that sufficient reasons exist for taking such a step. But, as already stated, misconduct is not the only legitimate ground for refusing a renewal."

I think that expounds with great force, and with perfect justice, the true relations of this subject—the duty of the justices, and I concur with every word my noble friend has said—always remembering that if you are arguing the strict matter of the law, there is no doubt the justices have a discretion in this sense, that if you can find that they have taken into consideration the matter, and have come to the conclusion that such and such a licence ought not to be renewed, although you may not agree with them on the grounds on which they have proceeded, nevertheless it is their discretion and not yours. I can answer the final part of the Question put to me, simply by saying that a court of Quarter Sessions, like every other court, is bound to proceed on the same principles. I hope the noble Lord is not dissatisfied with the answer I have given.

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 16*th March*, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH.)

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions of Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz. :—

Great Central Railway Bill.
Great Western Railway Bill.
Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway Bill.
Metropolitan District Railway (Various Powers) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH.)

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing

Order No. 63 has been complied with, viz.:—

Croydon and District Electric Tramways Bill.

South Shields, Sunderland and District Tramways Bill.

Wellingborough and District Tramroads Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for the following Bill, originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:—

Jewish Colonisation Association Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

PRIVATE BILLS (PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISION) (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for additional Provision in the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:—

Beckenham Urban District Council Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

Great Eastern Railway (No. 1) Bill; Great Eastern Railway (No. 2) Bill, read a second time, and committed.

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill, read a second time, and committed.

Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway (Various Powers Bill) [by Order], read a second time, and committed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1).

Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the urban districts of Bray and Dungarvan, and the counties of Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney General for Ireland and Mr. Wyndham.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 2).

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the county of Waterford, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney General for Ireland and Mr. Wyndham.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the urban districts of Bray and Dungarvan, and the counties of Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 104.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 2) BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the county of Waterford," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 105.]

PETITIONS

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Gloucestershire; Sussex; Leicestershire; and, Exeter; to lie upon the Table.

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Aberlemno; West Linton; Peebles; Kilninian; and, Kilmartin; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition of the Scottish School Attendance Officers' Association, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petitions against: from Felling; Chester-le-Street; Wigan; Chichester; Edmonton; South Shields (two); Jarrow; and, North of England United Coal Trade Association; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petition from Jarrow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS FUNDS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 9th March; *Mr. Channing*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 76.]

PHYSICAL TRAINING (SCOTLAND) (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy presented, of Report of the Royal Commission on Physical Training in Scotland. Vol. I., Report and Appendix, and Vol. II., Minutes of Evidence and Index [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS (SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS—MEAL HOURS IN ELECTRICAL STATIONS).

Copy presented, of Order, dated 11th March, 1903, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 40 (4) of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, extending (subject to certain conditions) the special exceptions as to meal hours to young persons above the age of sixteen years employed in Electrical Stations [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS (SPECIAL EXCEPTION—NIGHT WORK AT ELECTRICAL STATIONS).

Copy presented, of Order, dated 11th March, 1903, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 54 (4) of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, extending the special exception under that section (subject to certain conditions) to the employment at night in electrical stations of male young persons of the age of sixteen years and upwards [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Copy presented, of licence granted to Rolla Richards, a convict, permitting him to be at large, to which are annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule A of The Penal Servitude Act, 1864 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 AND 1896.

Copies presented, of Three Orders, numbered 6620, 6621, and 6633, respectively, relating to the landing of foreign animals in Great Britain [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.

Friendly Societies, Workmen's Compensation Schemes, Industrial and Provident Societies, and Trade Unions—Reports of the Chief Registrar for the year ending 31st December, 1902 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 77.]

AMERICAN MAIL SERVICE.

Return ordered, "showing the number of days, hours, and minutes occupied in the transit of the Royal Mails, both outward and inward carried during the year 1902 by steamships between Queenstown and New York, between Southampton and New York, and also between New York and Plymouth; the Return to specify the names of steamers, and to indicate, by asterisk or otherwise, those not carrying mails under contract."—(*Sir John Leng.*)

LABOURERS' COTTAGES (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "in respect of Labourers' Cottages in Ireland, showing, (1) county; (2) rural district; (3) valuation of rural district; (4) number of Labourers' Cottages (a) built, (b) in course of construction; (5) amount of loans (a) sanctioned, (b) received; (6) amount required to be raised annually in repayment of loans sanctioned; (7) amount which would be raised by the maximum rate of one shilling in the pound allowed for purposes of Acts; (8) rate per pound required to raise amount specified in Column 6; (9) present poundage rate levied on rural district for Labourers'

Acts' purposes; (10) amount of Exchequer Contribution for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1903; (11) amount of rent received from tenants of cottages and plots during year; (12) unissued balance, if any, of county's share of Exchequer Contribution; (13) totals per county, and province, and for all Ireland; (14) the Return to be made up to the 31st day of March, 1903."—(*Mr. Thomas O'Donnell.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Delhi Durbar.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if, in view of the fact that no popular boon or concession has been granted, according to ancient usage, in connection with the Delhi Durbar, His Majesty's Government will direct the Government of India to take some early opportunity to rectify this omission.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour*). I am not prepared to admit the validity of the principle upon which the Question of the hon. Member appears to proceed.

Swine Fever—Police Prosecution.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, E.): To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he is aware that Mr. Bown, of Mudford, Somerset, was summoned for neglecting to notify swine fever on his premises; and whether, seeing that an inspector of the Board had previously inspected the swine on such premises, and though knowing them to be infected had not so informed the owner, he will explain why the inspector did not at once inform Mr. Bown of his swine being affected, so that Mr. Bown might have notified to the police and have refrained from moving any pigs off his farm.

(*Answered by Mr. Hanbury.*) The inspector was not in a position to state definitely that swine fever existed on the premises of Mr. Bown until a *post-mortem* examination of viscera had taken place, but he informed the owner that he suspected the existence of the disease on his premises, and pointed out to him his obligation, in any case of suspicion, to report the case to the police. This, however, Mr. Bown did not do, and on *post-mortem* examination proving the existence of disease, he was summoned by the police. The obligation to report applies equally to pigs suspected of swine fever as to those which are actually affected.

Navy—Service on Royal Yacht—Promotions.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, will he state what the practice is with regard to the promotion of naval officers to a superior rank after service in the Royal yacht; how many officers, and of what ranks, have been promoted after such service during each of the last five years; are appointments for service in the Royal yacht made by any rule as to seniority or as to the position of those appointed in the examinations whereby the abilities of officers are tested; and, if not, by what rule are they made; and do the Admiralty propose to continue the practice of promoting over the heads of other officers those who have served in the Royal yacht.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) It is usual for a commander to be promoted after three years service, a lieutenant after two years service, and sub-lieutenants after one season in the Royal yacht. During the last five years one lieutenant and three sub-lieutenants have been promoted in each year after service in the Royal yacht. Two commanders have also been promoted during the same period. Officers appointed to the Royal yacht are selected by His Majesty from amongst those recommended by the First Lord of the Admiralty, who takes into account their official record, their position on the list, and their war service in making his recommendations, but there is no definite rule such as is suggested in the Question. It is not in contemplation to make any change in the practice with regard to these appointments.

Naval Cadets.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, by whom will the nominations to compete for entrance to the "Britannia" for cadetships for the Executive Officers, Engineers, and Royal Marine Officers be granted under the new Admiralty Scheme. How many nominations for naval cadetships for Executive Officers alone were granted by the First Lord during the year 1902, and how many is it estimated that he will grant during the year 1903 for the whole of the three branches, viz., Executive, Engineers, and Marines. Who, under the new scheme, will decide whether, among the applicants for nomination, other things are equal, and whether preference shall or shall not be given to those among them whose parents declare that the boys aged 12 will be ready at the age of 20 to enter either of the three branches. And will the Admiralty consider whether it would not be preferable to establish a system of open competition for all the cadetships.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The intention is that the system under which nominations are granted for the naval cadetship examinations shall continue under the new scheme generally on the same lines as heretofore. The number of candidates who competed in the examinations for cadetships in 1902 on the nomination of the First Lord was 640 (including in this number those who competed more than once), and as far as can be foreseen at present, the number of nominations for the various examinations under both the old and new schemes during 1903 is likely to be about 750. The First Lord of the Admiralty is the ultimate authority in all matters connected with the entry of cadets. The answer to the last part of the Question is in the negative.

Evacuation of Shanghai.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will state the dates of the evacuation of Shanghai by the various detachments of foreign troops.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne*). The Japanese troops left on the 22nd November. The British troops left on the 22nd December, the French troops on the 27th December, and the Germans on the 3rd January.

Atrocities in the Congo.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether the Government have received any reports of atrocities perpetrated on the natives of the Congo State by the agents of the Congo Administration; and, if so, whether any representations will be made to the Government concerned on the subject.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) I answered a Question on Wednesday to the same effect as that put by the hon. Gentleman.†

St. Louis Exhibition—Irish Industries.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Irish Government intend to take any steps, and if so what, to have Irish industries represented at the forthcoming St. Louis Exhibition.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) His Majesty's Government have received no confirmation of the report which has appeared in the newspapers on the subject.

Local Councils—Payment of Government Grants.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if any further payments will be received by County Councils in respect of the residue (Beer and Spirits Duty) grant during the present financial year; if the sums received in respect of the present financial year are likely to be greater or less than those received in respect of the last financial year; and if he would consider if he could give any further information as to these receipts to the County Councils and County Borough Councils (if possible in the month of March in each year), so as to enable them to frame their educational budgets with some degree of exactitude.

(*Answered by Mr. Ritchie.*) I understand that a further instalment of the residue grant, amounting to £150,000, will be distributed very shortly among the County Councils and County

---

† See page 382.

Borough Councils. I cannot at present state exactly the amount that will be distributable in respect of the present financial year, but I will endeavour to arrange with the Local Government Board and the Revenue authorities, so that the latest information as to the state of the Local Taxation Revenue from time to time may be placed at the disposal of the local authorities.

Imported Milk—Preservatives.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will state what was the amount of preservatives, and what kinds of preservatives, were found in the samples of fresh and sterilised milk imported from abroad and examined at the Government laboratories during 1902.

(*Answered by Mr. Ritchie.*) The samples of fresh and sterilised milk in question, with the exception of those taken from frozen milk, in which preservatives are not employed, were all examined for boric preservatives and for formalin, but in no case was either preservative detected.

Scotland—Treatment of Consumption as an Infectious Disease.

Mr. CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston): To ask the Lord Advocate if local authorities in Scotland are empowered to make provision for the treatment of consumption as an infectious disease.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) Having in view the general scope of the provisions as to infectious diseases contained in the Notification Act and the Public Health Act, the employment of public funds by the local authority in the way suggested by the hon. Member would raise a legal question affecting the ratepayers, on which, as I have no authority to determine it, I must respectfully decline to give an opinion.

Civil Service—Clerks at Maximum Salary.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury how many of the 105 second class principal clerks of the Inland Revenue Department are receiving the maximum salary of that class, and how many of the corresponding grade in the outdoor service—*i.e.*, the 234 second class supervisors—are at the maximum of that class, and how many of each grade have been receiving the maximum for a period of five years or longer, and how many of the twenty-four clerks who passed in 1900 for the position of principal clerk (second class) remain still unappointed to that position; and what steps the Board of Inland Revenue intend to take in order to enable these clerks to obtain the promotion for which they qualified in 1900 within a reasonable time.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) Seventy-one second class principal clerks, and 107 second class supervisors, are receiving the maximum of their class. Of these, thirty-two principal clerks and thirteen supervisors have been at their maximum for five years or more. Twelve of the clerks who passed in 1900 for the position of principal clerk (second class) are still unappointed to that position. They will obtain promotion in the ordinary way as vacancies occur.

New Post Office at Lurgan.

Colonel SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): To ask the Postmaster General whether he will state when it is proposed to proceed with the erection of the post office at Lurgan.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) It is proposed to begin building the new post office at Lurgan next financial year, if Parliament votes the money.

Extra Police at Ballylaneen.

Mr. POWER (Waterford, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain why extra police were drafted into the villages of Ballylaneen and Kilmacthomas, county Waterford, on the day Mr. Matthew Power was released from prison; and will he state whether the county will be charged with the cost incurred by drafting these extra men into these villages; and, if so, what will the cost be.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) A small force of ten men was detailed for duty on this occasion in anticipation of a disturbance of the public peace, which, happily, was not realised. Any expense that may have been incurred will be defrayed from the Constabulary Vote.

Ireland—Estates for sale in the Land Judge's Court.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number and the acreage of the estates for sale in the Land Judge's Court in Ireland on the 31st December, 1902, and the names of the owners of such estates.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I am informed that the preparation of a return containing this information would, in the opinion of the Land Judge, make such demands upon the time and labour of his staff as would seriously impede the working of his Court. Under the circumstances, and at a time of pressure like the present, I am reluctant to ask the Judge to undertake the return, and regret, therefore, that I cannot consent to it. I may add, however, that among the returns which I have promised to lay before Parliament in connection with the forthcoming Land Bill is one giving full information under a number of different heads in respect of the operations of the various Land Purchase Acts. This return will show the extent to which Section 40 of the Land Act of 1896, administered by the Land Judge, has been availed of down to the end of last year.

Bandoliers for the Army and Volunteers.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that the cartridge pouches and bandoliers with which the troops were equipped in South Africa were unsuitable and were the means of supplying the enemy with quantities of ammunition, it is proposed to issue serviceable leather bandoliers to soldiers and volunteers; and, if so, when these are to be provided.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Trials are now proceeding of equipments with improved arrangements for carrying ammunition.

Cavalry—Reasons for Abolition of the Lance.

MAJOR WYNDHAM-QUIN (Glamorganshire, South): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state on what grounds he has decided to issue an order abolishing the use of the lance by the cavalry on active service.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) This is a purely military question which it is quite impracticable to discuss in the form of a reply to a Question.

Officers on Half-pay.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War can he state for the five years, 1898 to 1903, respectively, the totals for half-pay required for officers eligible for employment, specifying the percentage of those sums, also that of the Non-effective Vote to the Army Estimates for each year.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The figures showing the amount of half-pay taken in Army Estimates, and the percentage to the normal Estimates, are as follows:—

	Half-pay	Percentage.
1898–1899 - - -	76,800	·40
1899–1900 - - -	78,100	·38
1900–1901 - - -	71,000	·24
1901–1902 - - -	73,000	·25
1902–1903 - - -	80,000	·27

West Yorkshire (Volunteer) Artillery.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall): To ask the Secretary of State for War under what circumstances orders have recently been issued by the Adjutant General to the 4th West Yorkshire Artillery (Volunteers) that no greater mobility than that of infantry shall be required of them, and that not more than two horses per gun shall be employed during their annual training; and whether, in view of the fact that this corps consists of four batteries equipped with field guns, and has been efficiently trained for many years past as field artillery, he will have the orders in question rescinded and give the necessary financial assistance to enable the corps to be properly horsed during its annual training.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The Commander-in-Chief holds that all Artillery Volunteers, whatever armament they may now be in possession of, are not to be trained to manœuvre with cavalry, but that it will be sufficient for them to move at the same pace as infantry. As regards the allusion to the employment of two horses per gun, no such instruction has been issued.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Military Works Bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, whether a Military Works Bill will be introduced this session; and, if so, how much money will be borrowed under it.

The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford): It is intended to introduce a further Military Works Bill in the course of the session, but I cannot at present state the additional amount of money that will be included. It was clearly stated on the introduction of the Bill in 1901, that the amount then taken was only an instalment and represented the sum that it was anticipated could be spent prudently within the next two years.

Flogging of Drummer Boys.

Mr. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state under what circumstances two drummer boys were recently flogged in the Grenadier Guards, for what offence, under whose orders, and by what authority; what punishment has been inflicted on those responsible; and what steps have been taken to prevent the recurrence of similar practices.

Mr. BRODRICK: Lieutenant-Colonel Kinloch, commanding the 1st Battalion Grenadier Guards at the time, had given orders that boys under age in that battalion were not to be allowed to smoke. On the 28th February, 1902, a boy, who had given a great deal of trouble, was brought before an officer for smoking, and the Acting Adjutant of the 1st Battalion Grenadier Guards, at the instigation of Lieutenant-Colonel Kinloch, sentenced the boy to receive eight strokes with a birch rod. The following morning, before the punishment had been inflicted, the boy broke out of barracks, went to Aldershot, where he was apprehended later on, and was sent back to the headquarters of his battalion. He was brought before Lieutenant-Colonel Kinloch, charged with desertion, and the latter, in order not to mar the boy's military career by sentencing him to imprisonment at the outset of it, ordered that he should receive sixteen strokes with a birch, and this punishment was inflicted. On the 26th March, 1902, another boy of the same battalion was caught smoking. He received six strokes with the birch, by order of Lieutenant-Colonel Kinloch. This mode of punishment is not authorised in the Army, except in prisons, and in Army schools in a restricted form. The Commander-in-Chief expressed his disapproval of Colonel Kinloch's action, which was not in accordance with the Regulations, and these practices are absolutely prohibited.

Cavalry Arms.

*Colonel LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, for what purpose regiments of cavalry will, in future, be armed with the sword as well as the carbine (or rifle), seeing that the carbine (or rifle) will henceforth be considered as the cavalry soldier's principal weapon.

Mr. BRODRICK: The rifle will be generally used on foot, the sword when mounted.

Captain NORTON (Newington, N.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the lance is in all respects a far more efficient weapon than the sword?

No answer was returned.

South African War Medals.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War will he state why troops were required to be in South Africa between the 1st of January and the 1st of June, 1902, in order to secure the King's medal;

and why these troops received both the King's and the Queen's medal, while others of equal, or greater, service in South Africa received only the Queen's medal.

MR. BRODRICK: In reply to a Question put by my honourable friend on this subject on 5th March, I gave him a clear explanation of the grant of the King's medal, to which I fear I can add nothing.†

SIR GEORGE BARTLEY (Islington, N.): When will these medals be distributed?

MR. BRODRICK: I am pressing the matter forward as rapidly as I can, but having regard to the enormous number of medals that had to be made, there has necessarily been delay.

South Africa—Mr. Chamberlain's Mission.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies when it is proposed to put the House in possession, by Parliamentary Papers, of an accurate Report of the statements made by the Secretary of State for the Colonies and others at the various meetings and interviews held by him with the representatives of the different political parties and subjects of the Crown in the self-governing colonies and other districts of South Africa. May I say what a satisfaction it is to see the right hon. Gentleman in his place once more?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I am much obliged to the hon. Gentleman; and, with reference to his Question, I would say that I must take it as a compliment that he seems to suggest that I should publish at the public expense a new volume of my speeches—which no doubt could be quoted hereafter. Of course, I have no personal objection; but it is a matter which would require some consideration, and it would be, I believe, an unusual precedent. I am ashamed to say that I believe the total number of speeches delivered by me during my recent tour amounted to something like seventy. I had no time to read them at the time, much less to correct them, and I am afraid it would be rather difficult for me to correct them now, and that would also stand in the way of such a publication as the hon. Gentleman suggests. But possibly the best thing would be to leave the whole matter until the question is more fully discussed in the House, and if there are are any particular documents which the hon. Gentleman wishes to have published, I shall be glad to consider whether that can be done.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: I thank the right hon. Gentleman, and will adopt his suggestion. There is, perhaps, something a little unprecedented in the journey altogether — a journey in the colonies during which the right hon. Gentleman spoke on behalf of the Ministry. It is, therefore, very desirable to have an authorised version of the speeches.

Boer Prisoners of War.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the control and treatment of the Boers who were taken prisoners in the late war, and have been deported to India, Ceylon, and Bermuda, and detained in those countries, notwithstanding the conclusion of the war and the proclamation of peace, are within the purview of the War Office and within the sphere of the Ministerial responsibility of the Secretary of State for War.

MR. BRODRICK: As regards the safe custody of the prisoners of war in India, Ceylon, and Bermuda, and maintaining order and discipline among them, the India Office and War Office respectively are responsible. Questions of general policy in regard to these prisoners fall within the sphere of the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Who is responsible for the punishment of breaches of discipline?

MR. BRODRICK: No doubt it would be the Secretary for War.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxviii., 1550.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies under what authority, statutory or otherwise, have Boers taken prisoners in the late war, who have been deported to India, Ceylon, or Bermuda, been detained in imprisonment, and in many instances treated as common criminals, for nearly a twelvemonth after the conclusion of peace.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The prisoners of war in India, Ceylon, and Bermuda have been detained under martial law, which has been proclaimed over the area covered by the prisoners of war camps. Breaches of military discipline have been punished by the military authorities, but I have no information of any such treatment as is alleged.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies at what stations in India are Boers who have been taken prisoners in the late war imprisoned at the present time, and what are the numbers of the Boers detained at each station; by whose authority and on whose responsibility was a communication made to Boers thus imprisoned, that default in taking the oath of allegiance would prolong their stay in the hotter districts, whereas the taking by them of that oath would secure their removal to cool hill stations; and what course does the War Office intend to take with reference to these prisoners.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: (1) The prisoners of war in India are at present stationed at Ahmadnagar; (2) The number of them is about 800; (3) I have no information as to any communication of the kind alleged; (4) All prisoners of war are at liberty to go where they please at their own expense, except to the new colonies. They will not be allowed to return to the new colonies at the expense of His Majesty's Government unless they take the oath or make the declaration of allegiance. It has been arranged that General Botha shall send a delegate to the prisoners to explain to them the desirability of making the declaration.

Boer Prisoners at Bermuda.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, how many Boer prisoners of war are at present detained in Bermuda, and under what circumstances are they now detained, and when will they be sent back to South Africa?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: There are at present eighty-two prisoners of war in Bermuda who have not taken the oath or made the declaration of allegiance under the terms of surrender. They will be sent back to South Africa as soon as they take the oath or make the declaration.

Amnesty of Cape Rebels.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any, and, if so, what, decision has been arrived at as to the amnesty of rebels in Cape Colony and Natal?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The question of amnesty has been left to the governors of the self-governing colonies, acting on the advice of their Ministers. I have received the following message on the subject from the Governor of Natal, dated 12th March: "On the unanimous advice of my Ministers, and as a result of correspondence with you at Capetown and Madeira, I have exercised the prerogative of pardon in case of rebels still in gaol, twenty-three in all, and have issued a Proclamation providing for amnesty for all outstanding cases of rebellion, and for offences strictly consequent on the war. Details to follow by mail despatch."

South Africa—Vryheid.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will state under what authority, and on whose responsibility, the district of Vryheid, which formed part of the territories of the South African Republic, has been added to the Colony of Natal and placed within the purview of the government and constitution of Natal; and whether, having regard to the fact that the constitution of the Colony of Natal owes its origin to the Imperial Parliament, any addition to the territories endorsed by that constitution can be made without the sanction of the Imperial Parliament.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The authority was that of Letters Patent under the Great Seal dated the 29th November, 1902, passed in accordance with the provisions of the Colonial Boundaries Act 1895. Having regard to the provisions of that Act the consent of Parliament was not required.

Naval Works Bill.

MR. BUCHANAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether a Naval Works Bill will be introduced this session; and, if so, how much money will be borrowed under it.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): A Naval Works Bill will be introduced this session. The amount to be borrowed cannot be stated until the Bill is introduced.

Memorandum on Naval Training.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty why was the Memorandum, dated 16th September, 1902, concerning the entry and training of officers and men of the Royal Navy, signed by one alone of the Commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral, viz., by the First Lord of the Admiralty; did all the other members of the Board of Admiralty concur in the decisions and determinations therein announced, and especially did all the Naval Lords so concur; and, in view of the fact that alterations in the King's Regulations and Admiralty Instructions are usually promulgated by command of their Lordships of the Board, and by the Secretary to the Admiralty, why was the signature of the Secretary on this occasion omitted.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Memorandum in question was signed by the First Lord in accordance with precedent, which does not require that such documents should be signed by all the members of the Board. The answer to the second question is in the affirmative. The Board of Admiralty works, and has always worked, on the system of joint responsibility in the same manner as the Cabinet. The changes affecting officers were promulgated to the Fleet in a circular letter dated 19th December, which was signed by the Secretary as usual. The actual alterations in the King's Regulations will be embodied in the Addenda for the current year, and the usual notice will be promulgated to the Fleet in due course.

Navy—Changes in the King's Regulations.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty has the Board of Admiralty made any recommendation for the sanction by an Order in Council of the alterations in rank and pay of certain naval officers and the other changes in the King's Regulations which had been decided and determined on by the Board on 16th December, 1902; and, if so, has an Order in Council been made giving such sanction, and on what date.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The changes announced in the Admiralty Memorandum, issued in December last, have not yet been embodied in an Order in Council, except as regards the pensions of chief petty officers, as the changes involved many minor alterations in the Regulations, all of which required careful consideration before receiving the authority of His Majesty in Council. Steps are being taken to carry out the required procedure before the 1st April, when the new scheme will come into operation.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: May I take it that no recommendation has yet been made?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The recommendations are being drawn up.

Oil Fuel for the Navy.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it is the intention of the naval authorities to proceed immediately with the permanent arrangements for the storage of oil fuel, for which provision is made in the Estimates for 1903–4, or to wait until a more extended experience has been obtained of the value of such fuel by trials on His Majesty's war vessels.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Arrangements are now being made for the storage of such quantities of oil fuel as are likely to be required in 1903–4, should the trials now in progress be attended with generally satisfactory results, but the question of further storage accommodation will depend on more extended experience of this description of fuel.

Indian Cavalry.

*COLONEL LEGGE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether it is proposed to abolish the lance in the Indian Cavalry.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I have not received any communication from the Indian Government to this effect.

Indian Army Charges.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state the proposed increased amount to be paid by India for the increase of Army pay sanctioned last year.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: As I have before stated the Indian Government have agreed to pay the extra 2d. a day which came into operation in April last; this amounts to £215,000 a year. The apportionment of charge arising out of the extra 6d., which does not come into operation before April, 1904, has been referred to arbitration.

MR. LAMBERT: When will the result of the arbitration be made known? The matter has been under consideration a long time now.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: The decision to refer the matter to arbitration was arrived at not long ago, but I hope the result will soon be made known.

Port of London Bill.

SIR F. DIXON-HARTLAND Middlesex, Uxbridge): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state when he proposes to introduce the Bill with reference to the Port of London; and whether it is his intention to take the Second Reading before Easter.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I am not yet in a position to say when this Bill will be introduced, or whether the Second Reading will be taken before Easter.

Canadian and Australian Export Bounties.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the amount of bounty given in Canada and Australia on the production or export of iron and butter respectively; to what extent bounty-fed articles, other than sugar, have been imported into the United Kingdom during recent years from British colonies and foreign countries; and if the Government propose affording protection to those engaged in agriculture and manufacture at home on lines similar to that afforded to the West Indian sugar planters.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: As regards Canadian iron I must refer the hon. Member to the answer which I gave to the hon. Member for West Islington on 4th November last.[†] I know of no Australian bounty on iron. As regards butter I have no knowledge of any direct bounty, but the information desired will, no doubt, be contained in the return of Colonial bounties on agricultural produce, which was promised by the Postmaster General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in reply to a Question by the hon. Member for South Somerset on 4th December last. The Trade Accounts do not distinguish[‡] between imports of bounty-fed and other articles. The answer to the last paragraph is in the negative.

The Penrhyn Quarry Dispute.

MR. BELL (Derby): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade a Question, of which I have given him private notice—viz., whether, in view of the verdict and rider of the jury in the case of "Penrhyn *v.* Parry," he will now take steps, under the Conciliation Act, 1896, with the object of bringing the dispute to an end.

[†] See (4) *Debates*, cxiv., 8.

[‡] See (4) *Debates*, cxv., 1307.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I regret that I see no reason to believe that the expression of opinion by the jury has altered the existing situation, but, of course, if at any time I have grounds for hoping that the intervention of the Board of Trade would lead to a satisfactory result, I should be happy to take action in the matter.

Clubs Registered under the Licensing Act.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state the number of clubs registered under the Licensing Act, 1902, in England and in Wales.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): No, Sir, the information is not in my possession; and I think it would be better to wait until the new Act has been in regular operation for some time.

Licensing (Scotland) Acts Amendment Bill.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether such an interval will be fixed before the Second Reading of the Licensing (Scotland) Acts Amendment Bill as will enable Burgh and County Councils to consider and discuss the proposals; and can he state when the Second Reading is likely to be taken.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The date for the Second Reading of the Bill must depend upon the general arrangements as to public business made by my right hon. friend the Leader of the House. In any case, it is obvious that a considerable time must elapse before the Committee stage can be reached, which will leave ample time for consideration by all public bodies interested.

The Attorney-General's Fiat.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether, before granting or withholding his fiat to a plaintiff in an action to protect a public right, he requires any information other than a statement of claim showing a good cause of action, failure of attempt to settle amicably, and certificate of counsel that the action is a proper one to be brought; and, if so, what further information is sought or requirement insisted on by him.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (SIR ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): In addition to the requirements mentioned in the question, the Attorney-General must consider whether the proceedings are substantially directed towards the assertion of a public right, in the public interest. Every case is examined upon its own merits, and it is impossible to lay down any more precise rules upon the subject. If in substance the object of the proceedings is rather the assertion of private rights, the Attorney-General ought not to give the use of his name to the proceedings, but to leave the applicant to his remedy by action.

The Whitaker Wright Case—Costs of the Prosecution.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether the Crown will bear the expense of bringing Mr. Whitaker Wright to justice; and whether he will direct that the costs of the prosecution should be borne by the Crown rather than by the assets of the creditors.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: As regards the first branch of the question, the Crown will bear all the expenses connected with extradition. As regards the second branch, the question of the ultimate incidence of the costs of the prosecution will receive full consideration, but it would not be proper at this stage to arrive at a decision upon it. The control of the proceedings will, of course, remain with the Official Receiver, who is prosecuting under the orders of the Court.

Ireland and the St. Louis Exposition.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Irish Government intend to take any steps, and, if so, what, to have Irish industries represented at the forthcoming St. Louis Exposition.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): Yes, Sir, the Irish Government are taking all the steps in their power to see that Ireland is properly represented, but the nature of these cannot well be stated until I know what the general arrangements are to be for the United Kingdom.

Mr. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now supplement the answer of the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the 18th December last† by stating what arrangements have been made for British and Irish commercial displays at the coming St. Louis Exposition; and whether a Royal Commission will be appointed in connection therewith.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): A Royal Commission will be appointed to deal with the subject. Its composition has not yet been finally determined, but it will, of course, contain representatives of both British and Irish interests.

Mr. ALFRED DAVIES: What arrangements have been made for British and Irish commercial displays?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The object of the Royal Commission is to make such arrangements. If the arrangements had already been made it would not have been necessary to have a Royal Commission.

Mr. ALFRED DAVIES: Seeing that other Governments have already applied for space, are we not a little late?

No answer was given.

Roscrea Labourer's Cottage Scheme.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, in the first scheme made in 1899, the Roscrea Rural District Council proposed to erect a cottage for a labourer, named John Creagh, on the farm of Michael Hennesy at Barrahill, which the Local Government Board declined to sanction on the grounds that Hennesy's farm was too small, and pointed out that there appeared to be larger farms in the locality; that, although in 1902, in a second scheme, the council proposed to erect a cottage for the same labourer on one of the large farms referred to, the Local Government Board again declined to sanction the cottage, notwithstanding the inspector's unfavourable report on Creagh's present dwelling; and will he say what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The facts are as stated. The Board's decision in the case of the second application was based on the evidence given at the local inquiry. The District Council proposes to appeal against the decision to the Privy Council.

Irish Private Bill Legislation.

Mr. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has recently received representations and resolutions from the different sections of political thought in the country urging the necessity for alterations in the system of Private Bill legislation; and will he state what steps he proposes to take to give effect to these representations.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir; but I do not see my way to enlarging the legislative programme of the present session.

Lismore Workhouse Mastership.

Mr. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Local Government Board for Ireland has instituted legal proceedings against the

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxvi., 1637.

Lismore Board of Guardians to compel them to proceed to a new election of master of the union; and whether, in view of the fact that Mr. George M'Donald satisfied the clerk of the union in an examination as to his educational competency, and that he has acted as master temporarily and is now so acting to the satisfaction of the guardians, the Board will, before taking legal proceedings, apply the same tests as to Mr. M'Donald's fitness as have been applied within the past three years in the case of the masters elected in any of the unions in Munster.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. A candidate for this position is required to give, not to the clerk of the union but to the local Government Board, satisfactory evidence of his fitness to discharge the duties of the office. Where such evidence is not forthcoming he undergoes a test examination of a very elementary character. That was the course adopted in the present case. Of the sixty-nine masters whose appointments were sanctioned in the past four years thirty-four underwent the test examination. The Lismore Guardians are not unanimous in their refusal to appoint a qualified master. If the majority consider the Board's decision wrong they will have an opportunity of showing cause against the Conditional Order for a mandamus becoming absolute.

Killea Disturbance

Mr. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to an encounter between a number of the Royal Irish Constabulary and some civilians near the village of Killea, in the county of Tipperary, on Sunday last; and whether, in view of the fact that the police demand that the bands returning from a meeting in Templemore should not play when passing Thompson's dwelling at Barnane was agreed to, he will explain why District Inspector White ordered the police to use batons on the people, whereby several persons were injured.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir, my attention has been called to the rioting that took place on this occasion. A special inquiry is being made into the circumstances.

Mr. KENDAL O'BRIEN: Will the hon. Gentleman inform the House of the result of the inquiries?

Mr. WYNDHAM: Yes, when I have received it.

Cork Assizes.

Captain DONELAN (Cork, E): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Commission for Cork County is fixed to open on St. Patrick's Day; and whether he will take steps to secure the postponement of the opening of the assizes.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Executive has no authority to take the action suggested. The matter is entirely one for the Judges of Assize, over whom the Government exercises no control. I may add that the Land Commissioners have arranged that no sub-Commission Courts shall sit to-morrow, and the Local Government Board has also arranged that no audits shall be held on that day. But there is no analogy between these fixtures and sittings of the Assize Courts, and any alteration in the holding of the latter Courts, at this advanced period, would possibly be attended with difficulty and expense to jurors and suitors.

Promotion in the Dublin Sorting Office.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will explain on what grounds a second divison clerk has recently been promoted to the position of first class assistant superintendent in the Dublin Sorting Office; and, in view of the practice that this position should be filled by an officer drawn from the staff of the controller of the sorting office, will he say why this course was not followed in this instance; and whether the statement of the controller that there was not a man qualified for promotion in the Department had any influence in this appointment.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The promotion in question was made because there was no officer of suitable rank in the sorting office who was qualified in all respects for advancement to the position of a first class assistant superintendent.

Ballinhassig Post Office.

*MR. CREAN (Cork, S. E.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he has received a communication from the residents of Ballinhassig, alleging that the present location of the Post Office in that district is unsuitable and inconvenient, and that the premises in which the postal business was formerly transacted are still available; if so, can he take steps to remedy this alleged grievance; and further, will he say why a stranger, without knowledge of the people or district, has been appointed to take charge of the office.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: A remonstrance against the temporary arrangement under which the business of the sub-office is carried on at the entrance to the national school is stated to have been sent to the Commissioners of National Education and a copy was sent to me. The old Post Office premises were unsuitable and the newly appointed sub-Postmistress is providing new premises of a suitable nature for the Post Office, and they will, I understand, be available very soon. She is well acquainted with the locality, having lived in Ballinhassig for a year and in the neighbourhood previously. She was the only candidate who could provide proper accommodation.

*MR. CREAN: On whose recommendation was she appointed?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: By me, on my own responsibility.

Committee of National Defence.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the constitution and powers of the Committee of National Defence have been submitted for consideration to the War Inquiry Commission.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The answer is in the negative.

Private Banks Balance Sheets.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will consider the desirability of introducing legislation with the view of compelling all private banks to publish their balance sheets.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not see how you can distinguish between private banks and other private undertakings; and if the accounts of the one were to be made public by law, I suppose the accounts of all private undertakings would have to be made public by law.

The Case of Colonel Kinloch.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I wish to ask a Question with reference to the White Paper which has been issued from the War Office containing the evidence of Colonel Kinloch. That is only one paper referring to one part of a large transaction. When pressed on this subject on Wednesday evening the Secretary for War said that if forced to do so he would lay the papers on the Table.† He used the word "papers" in the plural. I have refreshed my memory by referring to *The Times*, and it is beyond all doubt that the reference was to documents affecting the whole inquiry. I want now to ask—Is the Speaker satisfied, first, that the rule that every document which has been referred to shall be produced, has been complied with; and, secondly, has the pledge given to the House been observed?

*MR. SPEAKER: The question concerning a pledge said to have been given by a Minister is one with which I have nothing to do. The other question is as to whether the document which has been laid on the Table of the House satisfies the rules of debate. I have seen that document, I have considered the matter, and I think it does satisfy the rules of debate, for this reason;—the right hon. Gentleman, in addressing the House, said that Lord Roberts had dealt with Colonel Kinloch's case upon Colonel Kinloch's own evidence, and he proceeded to give what he considered to be the effect of that evidence. He was challenged as to the accuracy of the statement, and he quoted from Colonel Kinloch's evidence the statements on which he relied. I was then asked whether he was not bound to produce the whole of the document, and I said yes, subject to his stating that it was not in the public interest to do so. As regards Colonel Kinloch's evidence, the right hon. Gentleman has, in my opinion, put in all that was necessary in order to satisfy the rules of the House. The principle of the rule is that if a Minister quotes from a document, the context must be placed before the House, so as to enable the House to judge whether there is anything in the rest of the document which would modify, alter, or contradict that which was quoted. In this case the question was whether Colonel Kinloch's evidence had been rightly quoted by the right hon. Gentleman. He has produced the whole of that evidence. In so doing he has satisfied the rule. As to any promise given by a Minister, that is a matter for him and not for me.

---

† See page 502.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir. H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Will the right hon. Gentleman say what business is to be taken this week.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: As the House is aware, we are now approaching the end of the financial year, and the date when our financial business must close governs our procedure for the next few days. It happens that the days of the week do not fall very conveniently this year, as the House will see when I tell them that the last day upon which we can take Supply is Thursday, the 26th, because Friday is a private Members' day under the new rule, which I hope will always be observed, and the Government do not wish to interfere with private Members' business. We shall have to finish our financial business then, on the 26th, and that being our limit I do not see how we can better arrange our time than in the manner which I will now submit to the House. The Navy Estimates we propose to take to-night and to-morrow, and I think we must get Votes A and I of those Estimates to-morrow. We can then take the report of the Army and Navy Votes on Wednesday, and Thursday will be devoted to the Vote on Account, and I may say parenthetically that I shall be glad to learn through the ordinary channels what Votes it may be convenient to set down first, so that we may utilise time to the best advantage. On Monday we take the report of the Vote on Account as the first order of the day, followed by other Supply, and hope to read the Consolidated Fund Bill a first time. The Second Reading of that Bill will be taken on Tuesday, the 24th, and the Committee stage on Wednesday, followed by the Third Reading on Thursday, the 26th, which, as I have explained to the House, is the last available day at our disposal.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): When is it proposed to introduce the Irish Land Bill?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: It will be seen that Wednesday, the 25th, is the day proposed under the arrangement I have suggested for taking the Committee stage of the Consolidated Fund Bill, and, as that stage is incapable of debate, if it is the wish of hon. Members opposite, I shall be glad to see the time at our disposal on that day devoted to the Land Bill.

Mr. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire): When will the Education Bill for London be brought in?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope it may be introduced before Easter. But at any rate it cannot be before we have completed our financial business for the year.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington W.): asked if it was proposed to follow the precedent set on the Army Estimates, and allow a general discussion before the Minister in Charge made his statement.

No answer was returned.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

William Crooks, esquire, for the Borough of Woolwich.

NEW BILL.

CONTRACTS (INDIA OFFICE) BILL.

"To remove doubts as to the mode of execution of certain contracts entered into on behalf of the Secretary of State for India in Council," presented by Secretary Lord George Hamilton; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 106.]

SUPPLY (NAVY ESTIMATES).

Order for Committee read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

NAVY ESTIMATES.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): I hope I am consulting the convenience of the House in following precedent by making my statement on the Motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair. I do not wish to dogmatise, but I do think it is most convenient that I should say what I have to say as to the general proposals of the Board of Admiralty, leaving particular portions of those proposals to be reviewed by hon. Members who have given notices of Amendments. I have to present to the House Navy Estimates of a magnitude, I believe, unparalleled in peace or war. I do so as the official representative of a great Department; but I do not forfeit my position as a private citizen; and as a citizen I cannot help sharing the regret, which I am sure every Member of the House must feel, that the bitter competition and rivalry among the nations continues, and makes this enormous, unproductive expenditure a necessary burden. I think we shall all agree in feeling that if the word of power could be spoken which would call a halt, and cause a discontinuance of the rivalry among the nations of Europe, we and they would benefit in the highest degree. Perhaps I have said more than I ought to say as representing the Admiralty on this subject; but I desire to make it clear to the House that which is my opinion, and I believe that of every member of the Board of Admiralty, that we take no pride in, that we profess no exultation over, the magnitude of these Estimates; and I think the depth of our feeling in the matter may be taken as the measure of our conviction, that these Estimates, large as they are, are necessary in the circumstances in which we live; and the only way in which we hope to commend them to the House of Commons is by proving, as we can, that the money voted so lavishly in the past has been satisfactorily and effectively expended for the purposes for which it was voted, and by showing that the money which may be voted will be so expended in the future. That, I think, is the only satisfactory justification we can put forward for this enormous expenditure; we must prove that it is necessary; we must show that it has been, and will be, well spent. I know that the system has not been tested. It is true, as is often said, that the expenditure and policy of the Admiralty have never been put to the test and trial of a great naval war. I am sure it is the fact that the Board of Admiralty are under no illusion as to the depth and the intensity of the responsibility that rests upon them; and I can assure the House that the spirit that prevails there is not alien to that existing in the country. They are united in the endeavour to meet future exigencies and deeply conscious of the responsibilities they have to bear.

I have to call the attention of the House to the figures that make up this enormous Estimate. The total Vote shows an excess over the Vote of last year of over £3,000,000 sterling. The *personnel*, which is of first importance, shows an increase of 4,600 over the Vote of last year, and the Votes by which we can best measure the amount of actual addition to the strength of the Navy—Votes 8 and 9 for material, shipbuilding, guns, and gun mountings—have been increased by no less than £2,000,000 sterling, or if we add, as we ought to add, the appropriation of grants-in-aid, the gross increase is £2,271,224. Hitherto, as has been pointed out, a very small amount has been devoted to what is technically known as the "new programme" as apart from new construction, and a very small part of the cost of entirely new ships has come into the financial year. It has become the practice of successive Boards of

Admiralty to defer expenditure on the new programme to a late date in the year in respect of which it is voted, and to a certain extent the amount has become illusory in respect to that particular year. I do not know that when the practice is understood much harm is done, for it is pretty clear we are voting a year in advance; but I am not sure that it is altogether an advantage that the practice should continue, and during the present year we are adding £451,430 to the Vote for the new programme, thus showing that we are taking steps to do away with the practice of making the Vote for the new programme in any particular year an illusory Vote. We are taking £1,151,430 for new programme work during the coming year, and I hope this will be the amount we shall spend.

PERSONNEL.

The question of *personnel* is entitled to the first place in our consideration, and on this I must say a word or two, for a good deal has been done and will be done to make the year an exceptional one in the history of the Navy. For the ordinary addition and growth of the Fleet, 4,600 men are added to the ordinary *personnel;* but there are other additions some of which are quite new to the House and some of which are not.

THE RESERVES.

There is in the first place an addition to the Royal Fleet Reserve. This reserve, as hon. Members know, is a recently created force, which is composed of men who have served and received their training in the Royal Navy. Class B, which is the important class in the Fleet Reserve, is to be increased, we hope, by 2,300 men. We have not fully realised our expectations with regard to the creation of a Fleet Reserve in the first two years, but the shortage is under 300. We are inclined to believe that before the year passes, and even before any part of the scheme becomes compulsory, we shall have a regular and satisfactory contingent of men who have served in the Fleet passing into the Fleet Reserve. The Royal Naval Reserve is also to receive a slight addition. I am glad to say that the firemen of the Royal Naval Reserve—a very important branch—are already over 300 in excess of the number being voted. But there is another addition to the *personnel* of the Navy which is peculiar to the present year. I do not want to anticipate legislation which the House has not yet had an opportunity of considering or sanctioning, but we owe it to the labours of the Committee presided over by the right hon. Baronet the Member for Berwick, that we are able to present to the House a Bill for utilising a new force for the Navy. We are taking steps, if the House permit, to introduce the principle, very carefully safeguarded, of short-service for the Navy. That is to say, we are going to take a certain limited number of men to serve for a short period, who, on taking their discharge from active service in the Fleet, will pass into the Fleet Reserve. I believe that if that principle is safeguarded—and I am quite sure it will be as long as Naval officers are at the Admiralty and as long as they are sensible of the value of long-service trained men,—it will be of very great value in adding to the *personnel* of the Fleet in time of war. I have no hesitation in saying, and I think the great majority of the House will agree, that to add an unlimited number to the active ratings of the Fleet is a step that requires very serious consideration and very strong justification. The numbers now are very large, far larger than those in any Navy in the world, and if we can, without any sacrifice of efficiency—as I believe we can, and as I shall show that without any sacrifice of efficiency we can—add to the number available, without adding to the enormous cost and the enormous burden of an increase of the active service ratings, it will be of great advantage to the Navy. The measure which I have already spoken of also abolishes the limit of the Royal Naval Reserve of which the Fleet Reserve is a part.

NAVAL VOLUNTEERS.

There is a third and very important part of the Bill which, I believe, will be acceptable to most Members of the House. It gives to the Navy the advantages of that great principle of volunteering which has stood the country in such good stead in the great land war in recent years. I am not one of those who believe that the decision to do away with the old Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers was an unwise one. I believe that the evidence as to the constitution of the corps made it obligatory on the Admiralty to recommend its dissolution. But I have always been of the opinion, an opinion which is now the recognised view of the Admiralty, that there is scope for sea-faring, sea-loving Englishman to put their services at the disposal of their country in time of war, not less satisfactorily than the Volunteers on land have already done.

NEW SCHEME OF TRAINING.

Now, I come to the question which I know will be probably the principal matter of contention with regard to our proposals this year; and as I know it is to be a matter of contention, I do not desire to detain the House very long now in discussing these proposals in detail. I allude to the new scheme of training which we propose to introduce into the whole of the Fleet. I think it would be unprofitable for me to occupy the time of the House by explaining in advance that which will be attacked I am sure with great ability and knowledge after I have spoken. Probably it will be more satisfactory if I endeavour to reply to the points which may be raised rather than to anticipate them before they are brought before the House. But at the same time I think I must make some explanation of what is a very important and very far-reaching, and, what I venture to believe, will be a very salutary change in the organisation of the Navy. It is a remarkable circumstance in regard to the new scheme, that in the Estimates I am about to present to the House it figures for a very small sum of money indeed, and the changes contemplated are in no sense represented by the amount of the sums involved by their adoption. The changes, as I have stated, are very important. I should rather like, at the outset, to remove one misconception—namely, that this new scheme applies exclusively to the officers of the Navy. It is of the essence of these changes that they recognise one great and overmastering fact in regard to the whole of the Naval Service, and constitute an honest endeavour to recognise the change from the old method of sailing to the new method of machinery, a change which has affected not only the officers but every rating in the Navy from top to bottom. It would have been a very incomplete and unsatisfactory scheme if it had been confined to the system of training of naval officers only. I do not know whether some hon. Members have exercised their imagination, or brought their imagination to the assistance of their knowledge to the same extent that I have been compelled to do. I have endeavoured to realise what the magnitude and extent of this change has been. I trust that the House will bear with me if I read what I believe to be a very illuminating presentment of the change, written by a distinguished naval officer, which puts the matter in its true light. That officer says—

> "Everything in the modern Fleet is done by machinery, be it steam, hydraulic, compressed air, electricity, to which will probably be added, in the near future, explosive oil and liquid air. Not only are the ships propelled solely by machinery, but they are steered by machinery. Their principal arms—gun and torpedo—are worked by machinery. They are lit by machinery, the water used by those on board for drinking, cooking, and washing, is produced by machinery; messages which were formerly transmitted by voice-pipe, now go by telephone. The orders which the Admiral wishes to give to the Fleet could formerly only be made by flags in the day and lamps at night; they are now made by electricity, that is, wireless telegraphy and electric flashing lamps. Orders which were formerly written out by hand are now produced by typewriter or by the printing machine. Formerly the Admiral visited another ship in his pulling barge; now he goes in a steam-boat. The anchor, formerly hove up by hand, is now worked by an engine. The live bullocks which were formerly taken to sea are now replaced by frozen carcasses maintained in that condition by machinery. If a fire breaks out in the ship the steam pumps drown it. If the ship springs a leak, steam pumps keep down the water. The very air that those on board between decks breathe is provided by a fan driven by machinery."

I make no apology for quoting that passage, for it is a very striking illustration of what has taken place. Now, what we want to do in view of that new state of things is to bring back that homogeneity in the ship's company which existed in the time of sails. In the old days there was a military element on board ship, which had nothing to do with navigating the ship. The naval officer then assumed the military duties. There was also a separate navigating class. Afterwards the duty of the navigating officer was made part of the duty of the executive officer of the ship. That is the kind of transformation we wish once more to effect. To do that, we believe that there is only one way, and that is to give a common training, a common entry, and a common instruction to all the officers who have to take a place in the command of a ship. There is much more in these matters than the mere introduction of competent mechanics into the ship. I do not underrate the value of machinery, or the men who drive it or understand it; but above all that, when you have got these competent machinists, and these engineers, something very important is lacking, and that is the naval officer. The naval officer, who, like every other officer, is compelled to take his life in his hands in the presence of the enemy, is a special creation involving the possession of very high and exceptional qualities. You may find men who, though masters of the engineering art, may fail most lamentably in many of the circumstances in which a naval officer may expect to find himself placed. It is no blame to the engineer or the machinist that that portion of his training necessary for service in the Fleet in the time of war, has been neglected. We are therefore brought to this conclusion, that we must combine the training of all the officers in a manner which will retain those great qualities of the naval officer which we, in this country, have so much reason to appreciate.

Then there is another question. Having determined on this sound principle, we have to decide whether we will take your officer young or old—and when I say old I mean after having completed his education on shore. That is a point on which there may be very just difference of opinion. There are continental countries where the system of education on shore is exceedingly complete, and where the latter principle is adopted. For instance, in Germany a naval officer passes through an ordinary school, and passes his leaving examination before he enters on his work as a commissioned officer in the Fleet. The other alternative is one that has always commended itself to the people of this country, and to which I am inclined to think there is a vast amount of favourable consideration to be given. That is to inure your naval officer to the sea from the earliest moment. I am not going to argue the matter, but the Admiralty in the exercise of its judgment have arrived at the conclusion, which, I believe, is shared by almost every naval officer, that the method of entering our officers young is best for the service of the Fleet. Given these two principles — first, that you must educate the naval officer to make use of his powers; and second, that you must enter him young—I think that a great portion of the scheme now presented to the country is the natural outgrowth of these two principles. It will, I believe, be felt by hon. Members of the House very much interested in the engineering branch in the Navy that, by coming to that conclusion, we have done much to meet the views they have expressed in this House. We hope we have done this; but I am bound to say that that has not been the prevailing motive for this change. It has been dictated by other and even more important considerations. However, I do ask of them to refer to the pledges which I gave at this Table last year on behalf of the Board of Admiralty, and I think they will admit that we have borne in mind those pledges and have given effect to the promises I made that the professional career of the officers entering the Navy in the engineering branch would receive consideration and would secure to them the same opportunities of a career as are open to all other officers serving the King. I will not now pursue this matter beyond stating that I am quite confident that whatever criticism may be raised in regard to this new scheme of entering officers, everything will depend upon the scheme of education which we adopt finally for the instruction of these young entrants.

It is a very great responsibility for the Board of Admiralty to take a boy at the age of twelve and to undertake his education. Of this I am certain, that unless we do our best by consultation with the wisest heads and the most competent authorities outside the walls of the Admiralty—for, after all, the general education of a gentleman is not a specialty of the Admiralty, although we think we could give a very good education—if we do not take every step to secure the best opinion as to the course of education we ought to give these young officers, we shall fail in our duty. But I can give the House this assurance that we are so conscious of the importance of this educational side that we are taking every measure within our power to develop all these courses, from the preliminary course to the last and most advanced course of the education of the engineer officer, by the guidance, and with the good will, of experts in educational theory and of those who are actively engaged in the practice of education throughout the country. Above all, I believe that the final course for the engineers is the one which will have to be considered with the very greatest care. We are told that the time will come when officers will be called upon to differentiate between the two branches of the service—between the more popular service on deck and the engineering service—and that there will then be a distaste for the engineering branch. I do not believe it. I believe that those who speak in that way view the future condition of things through the spectacles of to-day. I believe that if we give, as we intend to give, to these young officers an engineering education second to none which can be given at their age; if we accustom them to the practice of the theory and practice of engineering between the ages of twelve and nineteen, and if we give them a distinguished profession in His Majesty's service, we shall have no difficulty whatever in inducing these young officers to select this branch of the service. On the contrary, I am quite certain that there will be a readiness on the part of these young officers to avail themselves of the enormous advantages which we shall offer them. But a great deal will depend upon the character of the education which we give them; and I should like to tell the House on some other occasion why it is so important that the last stage of the education of the engineer should be such as will put him on an equality with engineers in other ranks of life.

PROMOTION OF WARRANT OFFICERS.

I said just now that we are not dealing only with the officers of the Navy in regard to our new scheme of training. We are dealing with every other branch of men who serve in the Fleet. We are proposing to do what I believe will be congenial to many hon. Members—namely, to promote this year sixty warrant officers to commissioned rank. In doing that I believe we are discharging an obligation under which I, on behalf of the Admiralty, put myself last year when I said the case of the warrant officers was one which deserved the sympathy of Parliament and had earned the recognition of the Board of Admiralty. It was thought at that time that we might meet the case of the warrant officers by devising employment for them in connection with the ordnance depôts; but considerations which seem to me quite overwhelming made it apparent that that was not the best way of utilising the services of these officers. But I think it will be admitted we have more than met our obligations by this step of promotion of warrant officers to commissioned rank.

CHIEF PETTY OFFICERS' PENSIONS.

We have been able also to give to the chief petty officers a concession which they have long desired, and to which, I think, they are thoroughly entitled. We have given them pensions appropriate to their present rank. I am glad to say this step has already had a great effect in inducing the re-engagement of this exceedingly valuable class of officers in His Majesty's fleet.

MECHANICIANS.

We have created a new rating—the rating of mechanicians. That, I believe, is more important than the mere announcement of the name would lead hon. Members to suppose. This rating of mechanicians will give an avenue to promotion to a very important class of men in the Fleet—that is, the stokers. Hitherto there has been no avenue of promotion for stokers at all equivalent to that which has been offered to engine-room artificers. In making this new rating we shall be doing justice to a deserving body of men who have earned the good will of the Admiralty—to a portion of the engine-room staff, whose services are so essential in time of war and also in time of peace.

BOY ARTIFICERS.

Lastly, there is the entry of a number of boys, who are to be trained in the dockyards as boy artificers, and who, we hope, will in due course succeed to the position of engine-room artificers on board our ships. In taking this step we are behind other countries; but better late than never; and I honestly believe we shall be able to give these boys a training in the work for which they are intended which will be a lesson to the country, which will be greatly to the advantage of the boys, and greatly to the advantage of the Fleet. I hope hon. Members will follow with the interest which I certainly feel the career of these boy artificers in His Majesty's service.

ROYAL MARINES.

Now, I want to speak about one very important branch of the *personnel* of the Fleet—the Royal Marines. The Royal Marines is a corps with a very honourable, a very distinguished history, and I am happy to say its internal history is equal to its public record. But there is nothing which is not capable of being improved; and I am glad to say a step which has been taken in connection with the Royal Marines during the last year and a half has been productive of very satisfactory results. The corps of Royal Marines has risen to the strength of nearly 20,000 men. There is no body of infantry of equal numbers which can claim any superiority over the Royal Marines. Since October 1901, the Admiralty have sanctioned the adoption of an inquiry into the character of the recruits for the Royal Marines; and I am glad to be able to say that the anticipations—and they were sanguine and high anticipations—that had been formed of the effect of that step have been justified, and more than justified. For instance, we have reduced in the first six months the percentage of what I may call the criminal wastage, already small, in the Royal Marines, by no less than 50 per cent. I am glad also to be able to tell the House that this stringency in the selection of recruits has not been accompanied by any diminution in supply, but that, on the contrary, it has stimulated the recruiting, and that as a matter of fact the numbers borne are slightly in excess of the establishment. We have given to the Royal Marines, as we were bound to give, the increase of pay which has been given to the Army; and that has been appreciated. It remains for us to consider, in the case of further payments that I understand will have to be made to the Royal Marines, and of which they have been apprised, whether that increase shall be given entirely in the form of pay, or whether it shall be given in the form, at all events partially, of those emoluments and ameliorations in the condition of a soldier which have gone far to make the Royal Marines what they are, and have made service in the corps so much appreciated.

MATÉRIEL.

Now I come to the question of the *matériel* which costs us so much. I know there are Members of this House who always want to have a record of our discharges in the matter of *matériel*. I may say this. If we have slackened in our rate of mortality it is only because the rate of mortality has been exceedingly brisk in the last few years. The result is that the number of ships struck off the so-called effective list of the Navy is smaller in this year than it has been in the past year or two. That is attributable to the fact that there were fewer ships that could be discarded. But we have withdrawn seven third-class battleships, three sloops, ten gun-boats, and one torpedo-boat, a total of twenty-one ships.

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Pari passu with that diminution, we are making a very large increase, and, I believe, a very effective increase. During the current year we have added four battleships—the "London," the "Venerable," the "Russell," and the "Montagu." Some of them are of a class of battleships which is faster, so far as we know, than any other battleships at present afloat. We have added five first-class armoured cruisers—the "Bacchante," the "Good Hope," the "Drake," the "Leviathan," and the "King Alfred"—two sloops, four torpedo-boat-destroyers, three torpedo boats, six sub-marines, and two ships which merit brief notice. One is the "Assistance," a repair ship which any hon. Member who inspects the vessel will find admirably fitted with all the appliances necessary for repairs to the Fleet in time of war. The other, the "Aquarius," is a distilling ship, the services of which are necessary, because distilled water is now largely called into requisition for water-tube boilers. During the coming year we propose to complete six battleships, eleven armoured cruisers, one second class cruiser, two sloops, four destroyers, eight torpedo boats, and three sub-marines.

NEXT YEAR'S PROGRAMME.

We are asking, in addition, the agreement of the House to a new programme. This new programme comprises three battleships — I am sorry I am not able to inform the House of the precise design of these ships, but I think I can assure hon. Members that they will be of a very formidable type and will bear favourable comparison with vessels of that class belonging to other nations—four first-class armoured cruisers, three third class cruisers, four very fast scouts, fifteen destroyers, and ten submarines. Everybody will admit, I think, that that is a very substantial and important addition to the Navy. But I can assure hon. Members that it is not a spasmodic or uncalculated addition; that every one of those ships is a matter of forethought and estimate; and that we believe this addition corresponds, in the first place, with the public need—that is to say, the need of the Navy for reinforcement—and, in the second place, with the facilities which our private and Royal dockyards present for the construction of armoured and unarmoured ships.

REPAIRS.

It has been already stated in this House, and any hon. Member who is familiar with our dockyards knows that the congestion in the dockyards has become very serious, and that the work of repairing our ships has become, I do not say more than the Royal dockyards can undertake, but more than they can effectively undertake in addition to the other work that is thrown upon them. It has now become the accepted policy of the Admiralty to send out a very large number of ships to be repaired in private or contract yards. That is a policy which I foreshadowed last year, and which, since last year, has come into active effect. I believe we are being repaid amply for the step which we have taken. In the first place, we are creating in the great contract yards a knowledge of work in connection with warships—a knowledge which we believe will be invaluable if ever we should be involved in war. There is much to learn, even by the most skilled contriver of vessels and appliances for mercantile use, when he comes to deal with the equipment and appliances of a warship; and this knowledge is now being disseminated amongst our great private dockyards. We have committed ourselves to the system, which is not altogether, but almost, new in the Navy, of allowing these ships to be repaired on a schedule of prices—that is to say, not too closely estimating beforehand the nature of repairs, but taking care,—relying partly on our own inspectors and partly on the good faith and self-interest of the contractors, to get a correct estimate of the amount of repair work which is to be done, at the contractor's yard itself. Hon. Members will see at once that there is an advantage in that system. You may take a ship in the dockyard and you may make an estimate of what repairs she will require by an inspection of the outside; but it requires something in the nature of a *post-mortem* examination to get at the real facts of the matter. The result is that, if you do not have some such system as we have adopted, you will get the dockyard authorities estimating for every kind of eventuality that may be conceived in regard to the ship, and, naturally, the contract is given for the carrying out of the whole of that work, which may or may not be necessary, and when she gets into the contractor's yard more work, or less, may become necessary than that which has been stipulated for by the dockyard authorities. That is, undoubtedly, an expensive and cumbrous system. But now we are sending ships to the contract yards, they are examined then and there, the defects which actually exist are reported upon by the contractors, and those defects are remedied under the eye of our inspectors by the contractors themselves. It is too early as yet for me to be able to give the House the result of this experiment; but I believe, from the information which I already have, that the experiment is one which is going to be justified economically, and that we shall have no addition to the expense which would have been involved had the work been done in the Royal dockyards. I am already quite certain of this, that it is amply justified by the ease it has given us in our dockyards, and by the rapidity with which the work is done in the contract yards, but I am not yet in a position to give all the details the House has a right to ask for, and which it will in due course receive.

ARMAMENTS.

I should like to say a word or two with regard to guns. There are, I know, some hon. Members who take an intelligent interest in this question of guns; and they have realised, as I and those who are compelled to inquire into this matter realise, that the question of the efficiency of the guns is a very important matter indeed. There are two things which have to be considered. One is, What is the total gun fire of the ship? which is important; and the other, which is still more important in these days of improved armament and improved torpedoes, the actual efficiency of the gun as measured by its muzzle velocity and by its striking power. These facts are not unknown to the Admiralty, though the attention of the Admiralty has often been drawn to their supposed short-comings in these matters. It has not been, and it never can be, an easy matter to revolutionise the whole gunnery equipment of our Fleet; but this I can say—that there is a steady progression in the direction both of increasing the amount of gunfire and the effective gunfire of our ships. With regard to the first point, we are now completing, or asking leave to complete, the protection of the whole of the guns of the "Royal Sovereign" class. We are putting new and more powerful guns into the "Barfleur" and "Centurion," and we are putting new 6in. guns of the latest type into the remainder of that excellent class of cruiser, the "Talbot" class, instead of the 4·7in. guns with which those ships have been hitherto furnished. We are making experiments with powder. I wish I could say—I cannot say—that we have reached an ideal with respect to our powder, though we are already getting a higher velocity in our guns, and we believe that the new guns we are about to fit in the ships now under construction will be an immense advance upon those we have at present. This will be due partly to the character of the construction of the gun, the length and the chambering and partly to the increased efficacy of the powder we have in use.

STANDARDISATION.

There is one subject which I think may interest the House on which I should like to say a word. It is undoubtedly going to have an effect on the rapidity and the quality of the construction of our ships. Last year I made a reference to a matter which was then engaging the attention of the Admiralty—namely, the standardisation of our work. That question has been dealt with for a year past by some of the most powerful engineering committees which this country has ever seen, gathered together, under the presidency of Sir John Wolfe Barry. Those committees, on which there have been representatives of the great Government Departments, are now commencing the product of their labours, and the first of their volumes on standardised sections has been already issued. I should not have spoken about this matter but that it has the greatest possible bearing on the work of the Admiralty. When I say, what I believe to be a moderate estimate, that the Government of this country controls manufactures to the extent of over £40,000,000 a year, and that out of that the Admiralty controls at least £18,000,000 or £19,000,000, it will be seen that anything which tends towards the efficient supply of properly manufactured and properly graded materials must be of importance to the Admiralty. Let me give one or two examples of what this means to a great manufacturing concern like the Admiralty. The 12-inch guns up to last year were manufactured by three great makers. The exceedingly complicated mountings for those guns which cost some £30,000 apiece, were manufactured with minute differences by these three great makers. We have now got these three makers into one room, and they have agreed to make every part of these great mountings interchangeable. That is a considerable advantage; for now, wherever these 12-inch guns go throughout the world, from all our stores we shall be able to replace any part of them at the shortest possible notice. With regard to another class of mountings, small, but not unimportant—I mean the transferable mountings of the 6-inch guns—I believe I am not exaggerating when I say that the effect of standardising will save us from £100,000 to £200,000 in respect of the accumulations of those mountings, which at the present time we are obliged to make and put in the stores, but which now are to be made interchangeable on all guns of the same class. We have taken the lead in this matter at the Admiralty, and within the last week we have taken steps to communicate officially to all those who are concerned, and to our heads of Departments all over the world, an announcement that we propose, in consequence of the efforts of these great voluntary Committees, to give all our orders for Admiralty material in terms of these standardised dimensions. I think it will be seen, therefore, that we are taking a step which is likely to have real value in connection with the building work of the Admiralty.

DISTRIBUTION OF FLEETS.

With regard to the distribution of our Fleets, we have had many mentors, and we have been told a great deal as to how we ought to distribute our Fleets, and what they ought to be composed of. One of the most pressing recommendations was that we should send to the Mediterranean a great many ships which did not exist, and it was my duty to represent to the House that we could not deal with non-existent vessels. But we stated that in due course we should send the new ships. We have carried out that intention. We have never faltered, and I am sure the House will be glad to know that, as the new ships came on, we have utilised them for strengthening the squadrons throughout the world. We have, moreover arranged for a redistribution of those squadrons which will be, I believe, in the interests of efficiency. We have actually added, not only to the numbers, but undoubtedly to the quality, of these great Fleets. The Mediterranean Fleet has now two additional battleships, an additional cruiser, and an additional destroyer. But the addition in numbers by no means represents the addition to the value due to the homogeneous character of the squadrons which we now have in the Channel and the Mediterranean, and which we shall have shortly in the Home Fleet. The constitution of the Home Fleet itself, I think, is a measure which is calculated to give confidence to hon. Members, who have felt, perhaps justly felt, that the attribution of the Channel Fleet to other duties might sometimes impair the value of the defence force in home waters. There is no doubt that the constitution of the Home Fleet is a notable addition to our Naval force.

COALING ARRANGEMENTS.

The arrangements for coaling the Fleet, which are enormously important, have been steadily progressing. The progress made last year was very marked, and if the House passes the Estimate we are now asking for it will be greater still. Nothing could be more disastrous than the neglect of what appear to be, but are not, small details of Fleet administration. The power to get coal on board your ships when they arrive, in the shortest time, may mean all the difference between defeat and success. I can assure the House that the coaling problem has been engaging the attention of the Admiralty, and that we are now giving effect to the result of a long and careful consideration in providing, as far as we can, plant for coaling all our great ships. And we are doing what is also very important. We are storing throughout the world, in ever-increasing proportions, the patent fuel which takes the place for storage purposes of Welsh coal. My noble friend the late Member for Woolwich, I remember, attacked, or shall I say, "chaffed," the Admiralty on the ground that we were behind the Turk in our ignorance of the fact that Welsh coal deteriorates in storage, and he recommended us to try patent fuel. I remember that at the very time that he was actually commanding in the Mediterranean there were many thousands of tons of this patent fuel stored under his nose, and I can give the House the assurance that what was begun then is being continued now.

NEW NAVAL BASE.

I will not say anything now about works. My hon. friend the Civil Lord, when the proper occasion comes, will tell the House, or the Committee as the case may be, what is being done. I will only say, briefly, that progress is on the whole very satisfactory indeed on the works which are so necessary for the restoration and equipment of our Fleet. I think the House has already testified its satisfaction at the announcement which was made by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, to the effect that we have secured a site for a new naval station within the limits of the United Kingdom; and my hon. friend will tell the House, with much more authority than I can, how suitable that particular site is for the purposes for which we have acquired it.

ORGANISATION FOR WAR.

I feel I can really dispense with going into any further detail, because it is my fate to follow on an exposition by my noble friend the First Lord of the Admiralty, which has probably been read by almost every Member of this House. But there is one matter about which I should like to say a word before I sit down. Some of my hon. friends in this House and I in time past were actively engaged in preaching a doctrine which has now found great acceptance; and last year and the year before I was permitted at this Table to say something with regard to what I called, for want of a better phrase, the "intellectual equipment" of the two services. The House will be glad to know that the branch of the Admiralty which is particularly concerned with providing the intellectual equipment is not being neglected, but, on the contrary, is being increased in numbers, and that it has received, I think I may fairly say, that position of increased authority and dignity within the walls of the Admiralty which, in my opinion, is due to a body which has such grave and important functions to perform. But all those, and there are many in this House, who feel the great importance of this matter must have been gratified, as I am sure I have been, by the progress which this question—the solution of which is so vital to both services—has made in the last few weeks. I would ask the House to reflect how great is the extent of that progress.

Three of the things of which I know hon. Members are most desirous are now within course of accomplishment. In the first place, we have the deliberate and constitutional union, for purposes of consultation, of the naval and military departments; in the second place, we have what I know many hon. Members attach enormous importance to—the personal attendance and superintendence of the Prime Minister at the Council of Defence; and, in the third place, we are to have what I believe is of great importance, viz., a continuous record of the proceedings of this body. Any one who has studied, even to the small extent that I have studied, the method in which these matters are dealt with elsewhere, must have a sense of the loss which is incurred in not having in this country any body of what I may call considered opinion, any body of doctrine, with regard to naval and military matters, to which we can refer, or on which we can draw with confidence, in support of any conclusion to which the Executive Government may arrive. It is undoubtedly the case that, whereas in some foreign countries the deliberate decisions announced by the representatives of the various great political departments on a matter entirely within their own province have always commanded respect and acquiescence, there has been no such acquiescence in this country. I have always attributed that to the fact that the public has recognised, with an instinct which perhaps does it credit, that men can only pronounce dogmatically or really with authority on problems which they have carefully studied, and that the public have not always believed that the pronouncements which have been made by casual though distinguished members of either the naval or military profession on matters of great complication have been the result of a life-long study devoted to this particular branch of their technical duties. I believe we are now within measurable distance of seeing written the first chapter of that book of doctrine for our guidance.

My right hon. friend the Prime Minister called the special attention of the House to the fact that the scheme which he recommended was in its infancy, and was probably destined to be developed in some method which he was not able at that moment to foresee or describe. He spoke with caution, as he was bound to speak, of the value even of the developed institution which some of us hope to see. He said truly that no organisation and no provision would enable any country to escape from the unforeseen and the surprises of war. That is indubitable;

but my study of the wars of the past would induce me to add to that a further consideration—that although provision and study cannot do everything they can do very much. Those who remember the history of the campaigns of Austerlitz or Sadowa can see how much may be inflicted on a country which has neglected these precautions and how much may be accomplished by a country which has taken them, and to what an enormous extent the events even of a campaign, which is sure to be full of surprises, can be anticipated by an intelligent study, before a shot is fired, of all the circumstances which are likely to attend that campaign. I believe that among the developments which the Prime Minister has foreshadowed we may look forward, perhaps at no distant date, to a study of these great problems by men who have devoted their lives to mastering the difficulties presented by the intricate problems of our Empire. When we have added that knowledge to the power of control and of investigation, which must be exercised by the Government and the Cabinet, and having, as we already have, this intimate association between the two departments, we shall, I believe, be better off in the event of the calamity of war overtaking us than we have been for long years past.

That is all I desire to say in introducing these Estimates; but I do want hon. Members to believe that the Admiralty do not put forward these Estimates or any of their proposals in any spirit of over-weening confidence. Everything is too obscure in regard to naval warfare to warrant anybody in adopting such an attitude as that. I can assure hon. Members that there is an earnest spirit at the Admiralty, anxious to lose no opportunity of perfecting the organisation; and though many changes are being submitted to Parliament, and many changes are being made which do not require the sanction of Parliament, I believe I can fairly say that these changes are being made, not spasmodically, not as the result of a whim or a sudden inspiration, or on the individual opinion of any individual member, but as the result of the combined counsel of the Admiralty, penetrated by a sense of the enormous importance of the work they have to do, and anxious to obtain the best guidance for their purpose.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Many hon. Members who attach importance to the ancient forms for the conduct of the business of this House must have felt regret that the hon. Gentleman should have made his statement with you, Sir, in the Chair. I had hoped, the Secretary of State for War having reverted to the old and, I think, the better practice, that the hon. Gentleman would have adopted a similar course, and allowed the Motion that you, Sir, do leave the Chair to be used for what I respectfully submit is its proper purpose, viz., the submission of grievances by hon. Members before Supply is asked for. The hon Gentleman would then have made his statement, as did the Secretary of State for War, on the Estimates themselves. I the more regret the course the hon. Gentleman has taken on this occasion, because by it he has obtained some advantage over me. He has made a speech before I begin, and he is to make another when I have finished. He has taken a sighting shot at me before I have got into action. I also feel the disadvantage under which I labour on the present occasion in respect of my personal inadequacy to deal with this matter. To many Members of this House the sea is a horror, the Navy a mystery, and the naval officer an enigma, and to attempt to solve that enigma, to explain the functions of the naval officer, how he is produced, and how dangerous it is to tamper with the provisions whereby he is to be brought to a perfect state, is a task which might appal even a seaman, and which is doubly difficult to me, who am, after all, but a landsman.

The sea may be a horror, but we who live in islands have to deal with it, for it is our only road, our only rampart; and if we are not its masters we must be its slaves. The first essential of this island Empire, therefore, is a strong and efficient Navy. I regret that even at this very moment, when the primacy of the Navy is so loudly asserted, there is in the highest places in the country so great a distrust of it that the Secretary of State for War has invented six new Army Corps, avowedly because he cannot trust the Navy to keep the command of the seas; while the First Lord of the Treasury considers the Navy to be incapable of striking a blow or producing any effect on the enemy unless it has an expeditionary Corps to help it—all which is contradicted by history. But all agree that the Navy is the principal force on which we must rely, and, if I may quote the remarkable document I am about to criticise, "by a strange decree of fate," it is this very moment when the primacy of the Navy is first openly recognised and asserted, which has been chosen by the Admiralty for the invention of what I presume my hon. friend would call the standardisation of the naval officer, so as to secure his interchangeability—but what I consider to be the absolute destruction of the naval officer as he now exists. I need hardly remind the House that the Navy consists, not of ships or guns—they are things of wood, iron, or steel—but mainly and primarily of the men in the ships, the men behind the guns, and, above all, of the officers over the men. Of those officers the only one to whom I attach great and primary importance is the naval officer, properly so called, the man who handles, navigates, and fights the ship, and manages the crew in the working of the ship. He is the only indispensable officer in the ship. Take away the naval officer and the ship is helpless. Take away all the others—the marine, the engineer, the chaplain, the surgeon, the paymaster—and the naval officer will handle and fight the ship as well as ever. In fact, he does do so, for many of those important vessels, the destroyers, with crews of from sixty to eighty men, are handled without an engineer at all, and all of them without a chaplain, surgeon, or paymaster. Therefore I say I have warrant for my assertion that the naval officer is the king-pin of the whole system. As long as he is there the ship will work, but when he is not there, or is damaged in his quality, the ship will cease to work as it should. Will the House consider for a moment the extraordinary combination which the experience of centuries has declared necessary for the making of a naval officer. He joins the Navy—he should, he must join it—young and at schoolboy age; yet not as a schoolboy, but always as an officer. The boy goes to the "Britannia," and finds himself not under a schoolmaster, but under an officer. He goes to sea at the age of fourteen or fifteen, and there again he is treated as an officer, and learns himself to be an officer by commanding men and taking responsibility at an early age. It is true that because of his youth his education is necessarily incomplete, and therefore he must have the schoolmaster to give him some instruction, which is a most necessary provision. But what is the boy's life? At the age of sixteen he is in school. He hears his boat piped away, snatches his dirk and pistol and jumps into his boat, and finds himself engaged capturing a blockade runner. After this he takes off his dirk and goes back again to school. It is a combination of theoretical and practical. He sits on a form and learns, but he also stands on a deck and acts, and at this early age learns to exercise responsibility and to command men. That is the whole story. That boy at the age of twenty is probably fit to command anything. That is the training you are now going seriously to impair.

I shall be told that nobody disputes the efficiency of the naval officer.. Then why touch him? If it be true, as it is, that the system and the traditions of the Navy have produced the most admirable naval officer, why cannot you leave him alone? One of the suggestions is that the naval officer of the present day has lagged behind the age. It is absolutely false. There is no training which has been so unceasingly developed as that of the naval officer. In the transition from wood to iron and from iron to steel, and the transition from sails to steam hydraulics and electricity, he has kept abreast of every movement in naval science. You find him studying and practising successfully sails, steam, hydraulics, and electricity; in fact, at this moment a naval lieutenant is being relied upon to instal the system of wireless telegraphy in Somaliland. Is this the man you must abolish and replace by something else before you consider him equal to his duties? But while I magnify the naval officer proper, I do not desire to depreciate the other officers. I believe they are all good and excellent. I believe the marine and the engineer to be admirable, as they undoubtedly are. There, again, if they are admirable, why touch them? But I claim that of all of them the naval officer is pre-eminent and most necessary. The proposal is to standardise the naval officers and to run them all into the same mould, and the method by which it is proposed to do this is to take them all at the age of twelve and give them all the same education up to the age of twenty, and then serve them out to the various branches of the Service. I say that this is uncalled for, dangerous, and calculated not to increase but to impair the efficiency of all.

It was on Christmas Eve last that the document was promulgated which I regard as the death sentence of the naval officer as he exists at present. It came as a bolt from the blue. It was wholly unexpected, and it was received by naval officers and those who had the interests of the Navy at heart in silence. The document indeed stated on page four—

> "The best authorities, naval and civil, will be consulted by the Board before carrying the plan into operation."

But on page three of the same document we had already been told that all these changes had been "determined upon," and that it had been "decided" to do the things related and proposed in the memorandum. What is the use of consultation after decision? No trace of consultation can I find in this document, nor do I find anywhere any trace of acquiescence on the part of authorities naval, military, or civil. I have seen many naval officers, and my experience is that every kind of naval officer, from the admiral down to the lieutenant—and I do not go lower than the lieutenant—is dead against this scheme. I cannot say that there are no exceptions. There is the exception of the noble Lord who was lately the Member for Woolwich, and who was accidentally prevented from slaughtering the Army scheme in the House of Commons by being appointed Commander of the Channel Fleet. This portentous document is full of tropes and figures and beautiful words and phrases—"solidarity," "homogeneity," "the decrees of fate," and "long-felt wants" are piled up together with a few asthmatic perorations, all dressed in lady's maid's English. It was just the shallow and plausible scheme to please those gentlemen who write leading articles in half-an-hour, and especially those afflicting dons who pen the solemn twaddle of *The Times* newspaper.

It was Christmas time, and there was much to do of various kinds. Festivity and charity prevailed, and the Press accordingly hastily approved of the scheme. But when time passed by, when those who had tried to understand the Navy when naval officers themselves came to examine the scheme, then indeed the tone changed. The Service journals soon began to show the defects of the scheme. Admirals and captains on active service have not scrupled in regard to the language in which they privately denounced it, but they dare not speak out because of Article 682 of the King's Regulations, which prevents the only persons who understand this question and know all about it from giving their opinion. And so it has been left to me, inadequately, to fill the vacancy. Now, as to the authorship of this document. Lord Goschen has thought it necessary to repudiate all credit for this scheme, and Lord Rosebery has suggested that it is the work of Admiral Fisher. Intelligent critics who have studied its style think they see in the scheme the hand of the Secretary to the Admiralty. I believe it is wholly and solely the work of the First Lord of the Admiralty, with possibly some slight literary assistance in phrasing and punctuation from the Secretary to the Admiralty. And I will tell the House why. In all great matters—and this is surely one of the greatest—it is usual for the Admiralty decrees to be promulgated and advocated by the permanent Secretary to the Admiralty, who is the sole recognised authority for communication between the Board and the outside world. But his signature is not on this document. It is moreover usual for the whole Board to sign when an order is promulgated affecting the King's Regulations; but the whole Board does not sign this document, for it is only signed by the First Lord of the Admiralty.

Again, no great change in the service or the King's Regulations has ever been introduced, nor, I believe, can legally be introduced, without an Order in Council. But in this case there has been no Order in Council. It is now avowed that although the changes are there, and partially carried out, and although you have your engineer admirals, and engineer captains provided for in the Estimates, yet, not only has there been no Order in Council, but it has not been thought necessary to make an application to the Sovereign for such an Order. The only reply that is given is that His Majesty will at some future time be appealed to to make that Order in Council, and that it will probably be issued on that First of April which seems the chosen day for all changes in our naval and military forces.

This document is perhaps the most remarkable testimony that the country has been afforded of the preponderance in the Government of the Liberal Unionists. In every official position of trust, they occupy a much larger proportion than the Conservatives. It is perhaps natural on the same ground that in the child's Noah's Ark man was represented as so much bigger than the elephant in order to show the intellectual superiority of the human being. They do preponderate. They are almost exactly one-sixth of the whole combined Party, but of the sixty members of the Government, including those pillars of the Constitution the Lords-in-waiting, they are not ten but six. In the Cabinet, which consists of eighteen Members, they are not three but five; and in the Admiralty they not only preponderate but they are there alone, absolutely alone. The First Lord of the Admiralty is a Liberal Unionist, and the Secretary to the Admiralty is a Liberal Unionist. It is true there is the Civil Lord, who is a Tory, but what is a Civil Lord? If you look at the Order in Council you will find that the function of the Civil Lord is to assist the Secretary, and there he is on the Treasury Bench assisting him. In other Departments there is something like a division of responsibility between the Liberal Unionists and the Conservatives, but here there is not. The triumphs of Venezuela are equally shared by the Liberal Unionist Lord Lansdowne and the Tory noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, but in the Admiralty Liberal Unionists claim all; and if this scheme is adopted the credit or the mischief will be due entirely and exclusively to the Liberal Unionist Party and not, thank God, to the Tory Party. In this remarkable document the Admiralty declare that they "have studied the question with prolonged and assiduous care"; that they alone "have the advantage of knowing all the conditions"; and that they have produced "a long and carefully thought out scheme the advantages of which will be inestimable and permanent!" And so throughout, in the English I have described, the praises are sung of the Board of Admiralty as it exists and of that the first First Lord who has ever understood the real wants of the Navy and has prepared to meet them. I do not wish to be unfair to the Admiralty or the First Lord. There are some good things in this document. There is promotion to warrant officers, increase of pensions to petty officers, free kit to stokers, better pay to signalmen and increase of artificers—all most excellent things. But they have nothing whatever to do with the new scheme. They are the insidious jam which conceals the latent pill, and therefore I have nothing to do with them. It is stated that this is a long and carefully thought out whole, but some of the most important matters have not been thought out at all. Let me cite some of them from the document itself. As to the education of the naval cadet, it says—

> "Every detail connected with the education of these young officers will be carefully thought out and considered, and the best authorities, naval and civil, will be consulted by the Board of Admiralty."

Yet these details are of the essence of the whole thing and they are not yet settled. Then again—

> "The sub-lieutenants of this branch (the engineer branch) are to go to the college at Keyham for a professional course, the exact duration of which will be determined with great care. The question of the rates of pay of the existing marine officers is being carefully considered. The lines on which the gunnery and torpedo schools may best be developed should now be settled."

Therefore all these things also, which are no less important, are not yet settled; and last, and greatest and most important of all—

> "The Board have now under consideration a plan for the complete reorganisation of naval bands."

Well, these are all undecided points, and some of them are of considerable importance, and lying at the root of the matter to which the scheme refers. They are all being "carefully considered," "considered very carefully," "determined with great care," and so forth. This really does not come up to the praise which is bestowed upon the scheme by the Admiralty that invented it. The matter is of vital import. It is manifest that if mistakes are made in this matter they will be very serious indeed. Let the House remember that if this scheme is adopted and put into operation, the full effects of it cannot be felt for at least ten years. It will take ten years for those new young officers to come into positions of responsibility, and probably twenty years before they come into positions of great responsibility, where the difference between man and man is most felt in the Navy. If these are mistakes it will take generations to remedy the defects which have been introduced. But why this upheaval in the Navy? Is the Navy bad, and have the Boards of Admiralty been incompetent? Is the naval officer so inefficient that he must be entirely recast? The answer given in this Memorandum is entirely in the affirmative. This is nothing short of a most tremendous indictment, as I shall show the House, of every Board of Admiralty except the present one, and also of the existing naval officers. In effect this Memorandum charges that the officers are ignorant, disunited, and inefficient, that they have no common sentiment, that they are not abreast of progress (whatever that exactly means), and that they are unfit for their duties. As to the Boards of Admiralty, of the last fifteen years, the charge is that they have failed to recognise the changes that have occurred in the Navy, or to make the officers competent by adequate training. All these terrible things have, up to this moment, been unsuspected. Nobody would have believed them. Everybody believed quite the contrary. We believed that the Boards of Admiralty had done their duty, and that the product, which is the naval officer, was truly and completely admirable. We should probably have remained under that belief if the hour had not come and the man. Let me quote from the Memorandum—

> "It is difficult to measure the change which has taken place in the last fifteen years. In that short period the officers and men of the Navy and Marines have increased from about 60,000 to over 120,000. There are several foreign navies more powerful to-day than the British Navy was fifteen years ago, and yet the relative standard has been maintained. Of the ships which formed the effective fighting ships of the Navy fifteen years ago but few remain on the effective list now. The country can judge for itself what years of strenuous labour these have been for the Admiralty, years in which every task fulfilled was forgotten in the anxious effort to fulfil tasks which had yet to be done. Throughout this period the Board never lost sight of the most important question of all those which confronted them, the education and training of the officers and men of the Navy, and the adaptation of that education and training to the new conditions under which the Navy has to work."

But these Boards were all failures. Lord Northbrook was a failure; Lord Ripon was a failure; the noble Lord who is now Secretary of State for India was a failure; Lord Spencer was a failure; and Lord Goschen was a most especial failure, because this very Memorandum cites his experiment with regard to the public schools which ended so disastrously. Every Board of Admiralty has essayed in vain to deal with this problem. They all tried and they all failed. They "never lost sight" of the question, but they failed to solve it. They gave "years of strenuous labour" but it effected nothing, and it is quite clear from this Memorandum that all Admiralty Boards would have continued to fail had there not in the very nick of time arisen a prophet, and the son of a prophet—aye, and the son-in-law of a prophet, and the brother-in-law of a prophet, and the cousin-in-law of a prophet to show how he could succeed where so many preceding Boards of Admiralty had failed, and if this be the indictment of the Board, what is the indictment of the naval officers? I will state in the Admiralty's own words what it is—

> "They [the Admiralty] have determined on changes which they are convinced are adapted

to the changed conditions of the time, and will increase the efficiency and solidarity of the service."

That means that at present there is not adequate efficiency and solidarity in the service—or it means nothing. Again—

"No seaman, however practical, will be fit to rise beyond a certain rank unless he has thought out the problems of his calling as a student, and has omitted no opportunity of acquiring the knowledge that makes up the science of his profession."

That means, that at present the officers of the Navy have omitted their opportunities of acquiring a knowledge of their profession—or it means nothing.

"The strength which its unity gives to the service can hardly be over-estimated, yet in respect of this very matter a strangely anomalous condition of affairs exists."

That means that there is no sufficient unity now—or it means nothing.

"Up to this point the young officers' characters have been formed in one school, and all these sub-lieutenants have received as the foundation of their professional education that common knowledge which all alike require. Henceforward their education must be differentiated to make them fit to perform those specialised duties which are the product of modern science."

Unless that means that at present the naval officer is not fit for his specialised duties, it means nothing.

"I hope that the officers both of the Navy and of the Marines will realise more and more in the future that the Royal Marines and the Royal Navy are but two great parts of the one sea service on which this country depends."

That means they have not realised yet that they are but two parts of the one service. What! Did they not realise it when side by side they marched up the hill at Graspan, and when after losing one third of their number they conquered the hill at last? This indictment is absolutely unfounded. It is a false indictment, and a cruel aspersion on the officers of the Navy to say that they are lacking in all these attributes I have set forth. At last comes this statement–

"In the old days it sufficed if a naval officer were a seaman. Now he must be a seaman, a gunner, a soldier, an engineer, and a man of science as well."

That suggests that the naval officer is not any of these. I say he is all of them. I say that he is all that already. All that relates to the science that belongs to a ship he is at present perfectly endowed with, and all acts required of him he is capable of performing. If you look at this document what it suggests is that the naval officer at the present day is an ignorant person, who has just stepped off a sailing brig and never heard anything of steam, hydraulics or electricity, and that he requires nothing less than a Militia colonel to teach him his profession. I say the contrary is true. I say that naval education has kept pace with every other kind of education. The "Britannia," the service at sea, the "Vernon," the "Excellent," and Greenwich College have provided the most practical training in the latest resources of science, and of those resources the naval officer has most fully availed himself. Steam, for the last quarter of a century, has been part of the training of the naval officer, and he has now, with the greatest success, added to that such matters as electricity and hydraulics. I can tell the House of an instance in which a naval lieutenant found the defect in the hydraulic machinery of a turret, which the engineer was incapable of finding. As a matter of fact the naval officer, by which I mean the naval officer properly so-called, is admirably equipped, so far as possible, with all the scientific knowledge that is required. He is a man you cannot better. Of course the naval officer lives away from the world, unknown; he does his work at sea, unseen and unheard of. But those who do know him know that he is a thorough man, whose soul is in his profession, and that there is none so fully fitted and equipped for his business.

Take the case of the Marines. Their business is to act as soldiers. They are admirable troops. There is nothing in the Army that can touch them. I do not know why you want to revolutionise or extinguish the Marines. Nor are the Engineers less excellent. When they join from Keyham they are absolutely fitted to take up the duties for which they are required. What now are the proper duties of the engineer on board a man-of-war? He is not an engineer in the sense in which a man is whose business it is to design engines. and who requires great theoretical knowledge and considerable imagination. The engineer on board ship has as his business to take the engine when designed, to keep it running, and to take care that it does not get out of order. The ship engineer's business is mainly a matter of handles, levers, and glass-gauges; he is not properly an engineer at all; he is an engine-driver. It is true that an engineer properly so-called—a theoretical engineer—is required for designing, but you only want a few at home; you do not want them on board ship. When a machine gets out of repair, if the repairs are slight the engineer and the artificer can do them; but if they are serious the ship has to be sent to the dockyard. Battleships are indeed boxes of complicated and delicate machinery, but it does not follow that the care of it requires any very high qualities; on the contrary, the history of engineering is—the more complicated the machine the more simple is the care of it. Take the telephone—it is complicated enough, but you can work it by your footman.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley): If it goes out of order?

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: You send it to the real, designing engineer.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: At sea?

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Take the case of the motor-car with its complicated machinery, driven by a *chauffeur*, who has never yet asked to be called an admiral. Take the railway locomotive. It is driven by the driver and is looked after by the locomotive superintendent; but neither engine-driver nor superintendent asks to be called a director. The engineering function is to drive an engine at sea, and to keep it in order; of the theoretical engineers you want very few, and they should be ashore and not on board ship. The present engineers and artificers are competent to do all that is needed there. Then why all this upheaval, why this revolution? The real reason is to be found among the engineers themselves. The Secretary of the Admiralty has almost admitted as much. In his speech to-day he admitted it. In his speech at the Fishmongers' Hall on 15th January, he said—

> "If the difficulty with regard to the supply of engineers was to be solved, they must have a thorough education, and it was necessary they should undertake to give their naval officers, who showed themselves competent, the best education possible."

The reporter, perhaps, rather spoilt the beauty of his phrasing, but it shows, at any rate, that he had an eye to the engineer. Again at Glasgow, on the 24th January, the Secretary to the Admiralty said—

> "He believed, under this new proposal of the Admiralty, the time would come when they would be able to give the engineer in the Royal Navy that opportunity within the service which they were sometimes told he had lacked, and which they all felt it was most desirable he should receive."

I think, therefore, I am justified in saying that, after all, the engineer is at the bottom of the whole difficulty. And this is shown in the very last paragraph of the Memorandum, in which the Board of Admiralty say that—

> "In the task of consolidating their work they rely, with supreme confidence, on the loyalty to the service of the officers of the Royal Navy and of the Royal Marines."

Why do they appeal to the loyalty of the naval officer and the Marines only, and not to the engineers? Because these are supposed to be going to reap great advantages, and not to require, therefore, an appeal to their loyalty. They have to appeal to the officers of the Royal Marines and Royal Navy because these are getting nothing, while the engineers are getting everything.

What, now, are the grievances of the engineers? One is that the engineer officer cannot punish his men. No more can a torpedo lieutenant, or a gunnery lieutenant, or an officer of the watch. In each case they have to go to the captain. In the case of a torpedo-destroyer, the captain himself cannot punish the man; if the man breaks his leave in a most discreditable and scandalous manner, the captain has to keep him on board until he gets to the parent ship, and he has to send him there for judgment Nay, on shore we none of us can punish our servants; if my cook sends up a leg of mutton badly cooked, I cannot give him ten days cells; my only remedy is to go to the magistrate. Therefore the idea of an engineer not being able to punish a man is purely an imaginary grievance. Again, the social grievance has disappeared. The engineer officer takes his place in the ward-room, and is welcomed there. I have never heard of any difficulty in the ship as regards the social question. All the engineering grievances, in my belief, would easily have been solved by the simple method of an increase of pay. That was the one solution. The Vote for engineer pay amounts to £250,000 this year. Suppose you had given an increase of 10 per cent., or even of 20 per cent., it would have satisfied the engineers, and contentment at that price would have been cheaply bought, instead of which you are revolutionising the whole scheme of education. Are the engineers grateful for this boon? Not they. Listen to what G. M. Johnson, Chief Inspector of Machinery, their great spokesman, says—

> "And what does the new scheme confer on the present engineers in the service? An empty title! A title shorn of all the privileges, accessories, and the authority which executive rank has hitherto conferred on its predecessors! A thing of shreds and patches —a discredited counterfeit foisted on the country. A deliberate extension of the system of veiled contempt with which the engineer has been treated by the executive class ever since they were first compelled to admit him into the ranks of the Navy as a necessary evil."

A "discreditable counterfeit." That is what your engineers call the scheme which was mainly intended to satisfy them.

That is not all. It has leaked out that it is the final intention of the Admiralty to get rid of the major part of the engineers altogether and to substitute for them artificers of a lower grade. If that is so, the result of your great scheme for the benefit of the engineers is that they will have been engineered out of the Navy altogether, and the engineers will find that they have foolishly agitated to their own destruction. But there is more. Under the new scheme the engineer is to go to the "Britannia" for from four to seven years at a cost to his parents of at least £100 a year. How are the families of that excellent artisan class who have furnished so many engineers to the Navy, and still furnish them for the mercantile marine, to continue to provide them for the Navy? How are they to send their sons to a service which requires so much outlay? How can they afford to pay £100 a year for seven years or more? This scheme, when carried out, will make it absolutely impossible for persons of that kind to send their sons into the Navy, and you will close the service of naval engineering to the class which has given the best men in the past, and which now furnishes the only engineers to the mercantile marine. I am sorry to have detained the House so long, but I feel I am doing inadequate justice to this most tremendous subject.

One other point. I have already explained that the marines, the engineers and the naval officers are all to be started in the same school up to twenty years of age, and that they are then to diverge. At first, to quote the Memorandum, we were told that "it is proposed to make the division into the various branches definite and final," but on the 25th February the First Lord made a revelation, and said—

> "I have no more doubt than that I am standing here that the scheme will work out so that all these branches of the naval service will throughout the career of the officer be interchangeable."

"Interchangeable." That is the end. It does not, indeed, include the chaplain, the surgeon, the paymaster. I do not see why it should not. If there is anything in your scheme the chaplain should fight the ship, the paymaster serve the guns, and the last consolations of religion be administered by the surgeon to the blue-jacket who has had his leg sliced off by the torpedo lieutenant. The scheme as it stands is no less ridiculous. It is impossible that a naval officer can go from the deck properly and adequately to take charge of the engines, and it is equally impossible for the engineer officer to go on deck and handle the ship. It is even more impossible for the marine officer to take charge of either, and the scheme is one for making every man fit to do every other man's business —which is impossible.

Only one point more, and I have done. This scheme will enormously increase the patronage of the First Lord of the Admiralty. At present he gives nominations to 3,401 naval officers only; but in future he will also give nominations for 466 marines and 1,210 for engineers, or

1,676 more. This scheme, in short, will give very nearly double the number of nominations to the First Lord of the Admiralty, and so double the amount of his political patronage. Nor is that all. The scheme declares that—

> "No sub-lieutenant will be compelled to join a branch for which he did not enter as a boy when applying for a nomination, but in giving nominations for competition for entrance to the 'Britannia,' preference will (other things being equal) be given to those boys whose parents or guardians declare for them that they will be ready to enter either of the three branches of the Service."

How a parent can declare for a boy of twelve that at twenty he will be ready to enter a particular branch of the Service, only a First Lord of the Admiralty can say. But see how it will work. Two boys apply for nominations—A and B. A will not declare readiness to enter either branch, and B will. A is the son of an Earl or the grandson of a lawyer, B is the son of a Dissenting parson. Will the First Lord hold the other things to be equal in such a case? He is the judge. Will B be given a preference over A? I doubt it. It seems to me this scheme will make a huge new engine of political influence in England which is extremely undesirable. I believe that the old system was right; that it requires no essential alteration whatever; that the new system is mischievous, and may be disastrous. The functions of the naval officer, the marine officer, and the engineer officer are diverse, and are daily becoming more diverse, and therefore their training should be diverse. There must be day by day more, and not less, specialisation, earlier and not later specialisation. But here is a scheme which generalises everybody, as though they were all to perform the same functions. The naval officer as he at present exists is admirable, but for that naval officer, who is a specialised seaman, engineer and man of science, you propose to substitute a hybrid, interchangeable popinjay, a jack-of-all-trades and master of none. I do earnestly hope that the House will not give its assent to this hasty and ill-considered scheme. Experiment, if you will, with your Army, and play what fantastic tricks you like with it. The Army is comparatively unimportant as contrasted with the Navy, but do not tamper with your naval organisation, which has grown up from the experience of centuries and has produced such admirable results as we see in the existing naval officers. I beg to move—"That the new scheme of naval training embodied in the Memorandum of the First Lord of the Admiralty, dated 16th December, 1902, is calculated, in its present form, seriously to impair the efficiency of the Navy, and that, before being carried into effect, it should be reconsidered and modified."

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University): I should like to second the Amendment because I regard the scheme of the Admiralty as fundamentally bad. My chief objection to the scheme is directed against that part of it which relates to the early entry of the boys and to their school time, between twelve and seventeen years of age, before they go to sea. In this matter the Admiralty are not themselves experts; they are rather obtruding on the domain of experts, and therefore they cannot find fault with any criticism of their scheme. But not only are they not experts in this matter, they have a very bad record in the past, because, twenty years ago they kept a school for boys of between twelve and fourteen years of age, and it was, confessedly, an extremely bad one, and an extremely expensive one. Every boy in the school cost £308 per annum, and of that sum £98 was found by the parent and £210 a year was found out of the Consolidated Fund. The school was occasionally inspected, and the reports of the examiners were incautiously published by the Admiralty, incautiously, because some of them excited considerable discussion. Then the Admiralty refused to publish any more reports, or to let the House know what the inspectors thought the state of their school was. In those days there came into this House a rising young naval officer, Lord Ramsay, who had himself been commander of the "Britannia" for two years, and who was returned to this House as Member for the city of Liverpool. Lord Ramsay gave to the House a description of the "Britannia" which compelled the Admiralty to abandon the practice which they had then adopted of taking these little boys and schooling them in the "Britannia." Unfortunately they did not raise the age, as urged to do at the time, to seventeen, and took sort of half measures and raised it to fifteen and a half years. The whole plan, however, of taking these little boys was abandoned.

Allow me to remind the House of the reasons against the plan which was deliberately abandoned twenty years ago, and to which the Admiralty have again practically reverted. The first objection is that it subjects little boys of twelve or twelve and a half years of age to competitive examination, which is one of the very worst things for young boys, and prevents their education. All competitive examinations are bad, although in some cases they may be necessary evils; but they are especially bad for small children. An appointment is given to the boy who answers the greatest number of questions put in examination, and the consequence is that for a few years he is not educated at all, but prepared for examination and taught how to answer questions. The system is a very bad stimulus to education; with these little boys it is something worse. The medical authorities are agreed that the anxiety and dread of these examinations, and the strain of them, are so great that they positively injure the intellect and leave the brain entirely depleted of its powers. In their scheme the Admiralty say that they will not make the examination very severe; but how can they make it not severe? This is a very long and carefully thought out scheme, but they have not told us how the severity of the examination is to be mitigated. In any examination the strain is very great, even if it is only in arithmetic, algebra, or an easy paper in the French language. The strain of the examination upon these little children, and their preparation for it, is enormous. In fact, so bad is the system of competitive examination for entering little boys of twelve years of age for the Navy, that the late Mr. W. H. Smith would never put a stop during his lifetime to the system of nomination, saying that it was infinitely preferable to examination. Lord Ramsay, the young naval officer to whom I have referred, said that the early entry was perhaps the most mischievous and most pernicious feature of the whole system.

My second objection to entering the boys at an early age is that many of them never become naval officers. Lord Ramsay had of course similar experience in the "Britannia," and he told the House of Commons that a very large number of the cases out of 250 boys who had entered that institution, and into which he had inquired, had consented to go to the "Britannia" in order to get away from school. That was a most brilliant idea! A very large number had also gone into the service because their parents wished it, although they had no particular taste for it, and did not think they were fitted for it. Under the new scheme the Admiralty entered boys of twelve and a half years of age who are afterwards to man the executive, the engineering, and the marine branches of the service; but a great number of these will not, when they come to years of discretion, wish to become officers at all. The Admiralty themselves see this, because they propose in their Memorandum to eliminate very freely during the course of training between twelve and seventeen years of age a great number of the boys. But what an extemely uneconomic and expensive process that is? These boys will have had spent on them a large sum of public money every year to educate them. In this long and carefully thought out scheme the Admiralty do not tell us of finance. There is no kind of estimate of the cost of providing our naval officers, but if it is like the "Britannia" of old days, it will cost the country upwards of £200 per year for every one of the boys. That is a very extravagant way of manning the Navy.

But I have a very much stronger objection. As to the spoiling of a number of boys, perhaps that is a matter with which the Admiralty think they have nothing to do, but this House, which represents the interests of the country, has something to do with it. How many boys are you going to spoil for life by a proceeding of this kind in order to obtain a number of naval officers? A boy may be entered at twelve and a half years of age and turned out at fifteen, and he will have lost, educationally, a great part of that time. He may not be qualified to make a good naval officer, but he may have very rare merits in another direction. The career of the boy is therefore interfered with, and may be utterly spoiled.

Another objection to the scheme, which is a very strong one, is that one of the worst things that you can do with any class of boys is to separate them from the rest of the community and give them a special education apart, instead of allowing them to mix with other boys. No part of the scheme seems to me much worse than that. It is quite true that in the Navy, as well as in other professions, you have to give at a special stage special education, but everybody who knows anything about education at all, knows that specialisation should be made as late as possible, and not at twelve years of age. Until you have to separate the boys for specialisation, it is far better that they should be brought up with other boys than set apart in the manner the Admiralty propose. Again I quote the authority of Lord Ramsay, who said—

> "This system of separating little boys from their fellows was destroying much originality of character, and narrowing the minds of future officers by cutting short their general education, and taking them out of the world before they had time to see anything of it."

Another naval officer, Captain Price, in one of the debates in this House, said that for the first two or three years he had been in the Navy he had learned nothing, and un-learned a great deal of what he had learned at school.

I have another objection; and that is that by this scheme you are practically restricting your naval officers, engineers and marine, as well as executive officers, to the richer parts of society. It is only a rich man that can afford to send his son from the age of twelve to the age of seventeen to a school at which he has to pay at least £100 a year. We have not got the details of the financial part of the scheme before us, but I assume that a parent would have to pay £100 a year, or perhaps more. In that way you will restrict all your naval officers to the richer parts of society. I dare say that the present executive officers of the Navy are practically drawn from the richer parts of society; but the engineers are drawn from the middle classes; from the young men who, born in a poor station of life, have raised themselves by attending the public elementary schools, the higher grade schools, and the technical schools in such a way that, at the age of sixteen or seventeen, they are fitted by their own industry, and without having cost their parents one penny, to enter the Navy as engineers. You are going by this scheme to deprive those boys, some of the best boys of the country, of an honourable career hitherto open to them; and you will shut that career out from all boys whose parents cannot afford to pay £100 a year for their education from the age of twelve to the age of seventeen. The reasons for taking boys at this early age, which were referred to by my hon. friend the Secretary to the Admiralty, are two, which will be very much appreciated by naval men One is an historical reason. It is that history proves that boys will not take to the hardships of sea life unless they begin at an early age. The other reason is, that boys must go to sea early to learn seamanship, which can only be learned by practice, and which used to be one of the most important qualifications of a naval officer. But are you going to send those boys to sea? If you were going to send them to sea at the age of twelve those arguments would apply; but you are going to keep them on shore, and in a school—one might even say an inferior school, from the age of twelve to the age of seventeen, and then at the age of seventeen you are going to send them to sea. Why not take boys out of the schools of the country, and send them to sea at the age of seventeen. With the great enterprise there is in education in this country, and with all the additional enterprise which the Act of last year is likely to give to the local authorities, you have only to say what sort of boys you want, what qualifications you require, and the country will supply them at the age of seventeen, without any cost or trouble to the Government; the Admiralty will thus be relieved from the strain or keeping schools for little boys, and will be enabled to attend to their proper business of managing the ships of the Navy.

I examined with the greatest possible interest and curiosity this Memorandum to see what the reasons were for this proposal. I do not want to attack my hon. friend or the Admiralty; but I may say that the reasons given in this document are rather, what are perhaps unjustly called, women's reasons. On page four we find the reasons, and all they say is that the change is necessary. My hon. friend has not told us why it is necessary; but he has told us that this is a long and carefully thought out scheme, which I should not have known otherwise, because it does not appear to me that many of the points have been thought out at all. It is also said that it is very important to have unity in the Navy, and that for this unity early homogeneous training is necessary. Homogeneous is a very long word, but I suppose what it means is, that we cannot have naval officers friends with one another, unless, as little boys, they have been to school together. But they would be at school together if they were taken from the ordinary schools. I cannot see in this Memorandum any reason given for reverting to the old plan which has been abandoned, and which I think it is a great pity that the Admiralty should now, without a great deal longer and more careful consideration, revive. The House will recollect that all authority, at least all Parliamentary authority, is against a system of this kind. Not only was this system condemned by Lord Ramsay and Captain Price, but also by Sir John Hay, one of the greatest authorities in his day on naval questions. Sir Edward Reed, also a considerable authority, at all events in the engineering branch of naval education, condemned it. It was condemned by Lord Knutsford, and also by Lord Goschen, when he was a Member of this House; and, although various Secretaries to the Admiralty, who had to defend the practice during the debates in this House twenty years ago, were obliged to say something in favour of the system, they very clearly showed that their sympathies were very strongly with those who attacked the proceedings of the Admiralty. Mr. Shaw Lefevre and Sir George Trevelyan sympathised with those who attacked the system, and the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, when he was Secretary to the Admiralty, was also sympathetic. Then we have another authority against it. We have the universal authority of all foreign nations.

Although no doubt we are very proud of our Fleet, and do not consider that any Fleet in the world can compete with it, yet in one particular subordinate branch, which is accessory to the training and education of officers, we are not particular experts. All foreign nations, without exception, take their naval officers at about the same age that we take our Army officers, namely, at seventeen or eighteen years of age; and as soon as they take them from the ordinary schools of the country they send them straight off to sea. I am told that our great naval rival — France — actually examined a scheme of this kind quite recently, but determined to pursue the old practice of the French Navy, namely, to take young men of general education from the ordinary schools of the country and begin their specialisation by sending them to sea at the age of seventeen or eighteen. I strongly object to the fundamental ground-work of this scheme; and I hope before it is carried out that these matters will be reconsidered. If hon. Members will turn back to the speech made in this House by Lord Ramsay—it was his maiden speech—they will find all the arguments extremely well stated. It was a speech made in 1880 and can easily be found, as Lord Ramsay did not trouble the House on a great many occasions. I strongly recommend that speech to hon. Members as containing a most excellent summary of all that is to be said for and against this particular feature of the Admiralty scheme.

May I now be allowed for a moment to leave my own ground, and follow the schoolboy to the ship to which he is sent as a midshipman; and I want to call the attention of the House to a rather important point. No doubt at seventeen, when the officer begins his naval training, you must give him practical experience of his profession, and practical work, as well as continue his theoretical education. I am sorry to say that this carefully thought out Memorandum does not state whether that practical work is to be given on a training ship specially adapted for training our officers, or given on an ordinary man-of-war. But whichever it is, I should like to ask the Admiralty to consider whether they think the provision made in their scheme, not for practical work but for the continuation of theoretical instruction, to be at all adequate. They say that as soon as the young officer goes to a man-of-war compulsory school work is entirely to cease, and that he is to be left almost to his own devices as to his studies. "A man-of-war," said Lord Ramsay—I must apologise for quoting

Sir John Gorst.

him so frequently but he is the great source of illumination on this subject—"is the worst place for scientific study that can be conceived." The duties of the ship are so necessary that the young officer is continually taken away from his studies, and when he gets back he cannot resume them with the same earnestness as if he had not been disturbed. He will be under no less than six separate tutors, men who have not been practically trained in the art of teaching, and who will have the supervision of his studies, without they themselves being at all qualified as experts in the art of teaching. There will be an executive officer to teach him executive duties, and an engineer officer to teach him about machinery, a gunnery officer, a marine officer, a navigating officer, and a torpedo officer. He is to be examined annually in all these subjects during the three years he is at sea; but the papers will not be set by the officers who have been teaching him, but will be sent down from the Admiralty. What will be the consequence? What is the result? Why, that this unfortunate youth during his three years at sea will be cramming for the Admiralty examinations so as to be able to pass them, and so obtain promotion. I do not think the three months at Greenwich which is to close the career of the midshipman will be at all sufficient to complete his intellectual and scientific study; and the only plan I can suggest is that these young officers should go to sea for a certain number of months, and be on shore for a certain number of months, during which time they should be engaged in serious study. You must of course combine study on shipboard with study on shore, and the only way to do that which I can suggest is to make the time at sea specific; and I am quite sure that unless some system of that kind is invented, you will find that the boy who has been to the Admiralty school from the age of twelve to that of seventeen, and has been at sea from seventeen to twenty, with the exception of this three months spent at Greenwich, is very far inferior to the boy who has been brought up at the ordinary public school in the country, who may have learnt engineering in a secondary school, and have become a thoroughly trained engineer by the time he has reached twenty.

I do not wish to say a word against the idea which appears to have prompted this scheme—the idea of making all officers brothers in the Service and giving to them a common feeling for the Navy, and preventing there being any jealousy as to any particular branch in which they may be engaged. But after all the naval profession is very complicated. You cannot bring up a man as a good marine, a good engineer, and a good executive officer. It is far too complicated for that. You must have different branches of the Service. By all means amalgamate them as much as you possibly can, and do away with jealousy as much as possible; I only say I think the wrong way to do that is to take away little boys from the other little boys in the country and segregate them in a school different to all the other schools in the country, and then to suppose they will be better men. I think if the plan is adopted it will only end in bringing misfortune on the Navy and the country.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'the new scheme of Naval Training embodied in the Memorandum of the First Lord of the Admiralty, dated 16th December, 1902, is calculated, in its present form, seriously to impair the efficiency of the Navy, and that, before being carried into effect, it should be reconsidered and modified.'"—(*Mr. Gibson Bowles.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): Mr. Speaker, the somewhat unusual course that has been taken to-day has at all events this advantage—it enables the House to discuss by itself the comparatively narrow but immensely important issue raised by the Amendment before it proceeds to deal with the undefined and unexplained magnitude of these colossal Estimates. I propose to follow as closely as I can the speeches made by the two hon. Members who have just spoken. I agree entirely with the point made by the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down that this is not a question in which the Admiralty are experts. This scheme strikes at the principle of competition in the public service, and it is therefore not a question for Admiralty opinion alone, or naval opinion alone, but for the people of this country and their representatives in this House. That leads me to say, it being a scheme of this character and of this magnitude that I do not understand why the Admiralty has been so evasive of Parliamentary control as it has in this matter; why it kept this back until this House had risen; and why it has entered into this scheme at this time at all? What has it done? What is the scheme of the Government? You have under the present system naval officers of three kinds; the executive, the marine, and engineer officer. The executive officer comes into the Navy by patronage at an early age from the cadet school, the "Britannia." The marine officer comes in at a later age and by open competition, and the engineer officer also comes in at a later age and by open competition, and in spite of what the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty has said, I believe there can be no doubt that this scheme has been brought about by the dissatisfaction which those classes of officers other than the executive have felt for many years.

It is no use to disavow the fact that it is the dissatisfaction of the engineer and marine officers that has compelled this Admiralty, as it will compel every Admiralty, to face this question. What is the grievance of those officers? It is the position of professional inferiority in which they stand with regard to the executive officers. The engineers complain that they cannot issue orders to their inferiors and have no control over them. Neither they nor the marine officers can rise to the higher ranks, and both marine officers and the engineers suffer from a sense of social inferiority. It must be taken to be established as a fact that the repeated grievances they have made for many years undoubtedly arose from the difference of entrance into the Navy—the one by patronage and the other by competition. That difference brought about this social inferiority, and I call the House to witness that this immense experiment is due to nothing less than the existence in the Navy of that cursed spirit of class distinction which is the curse of the country. Now what have the Admiralty done? They have not classed the position of the existing officers—they have, to use an old phrase, cut the Gordian knot. They have solved the question by making in future all naval officers to begin as cadets in the "Britannia" at an age of twelve and a half years, and by patronage instead of competition. They train them together for eight years, of which the first four are to be employed in giving them a general education, and the last four devoted to special education. After the eight years they are to be separated into the three classes—executive, marine, and engineer, definitely and finally, according to this scheme. That, I believe, has been mitigated by a recent announcement, but that is the embryology of a naval officer. It appears to me rather like a misapplication of a misunderstood scientific principle, but that is the scheme, and my objection to it, while not confined to the points taken by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Cambridge University, is largely founded on the reasons he has given.

What I want to impress on hon. Members on this side of the House is this—the proposition now before the House is whether you are going to abolish the principle of competition; of entry by merit; whether you are going to abolish that principle in the two branches of the service in which it now exists and base the whole of your naval service on patronage, in the first instance, and class interests and power in the second. That is the manner in which this matter has to be considered, and to that point I shall devote what little I have to say. Competition, entrance by merit, all these things go by the board, and the only excuse, the only pretence for an excuse, is that reverted to by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, which is, that you cannot get a proper seaman unless you catch him young, at the age of between twelve and thirteen. In other words, you have a declaration by the Admiralty that you cannot give a boy the proper sea-character unless you begin at twelve and a half years. That is a business point for the House to consider, and it is to the consideration of this point that I desire to devote a few moments. There is not a unanimous naval opinion on this question; so far as I know it is a point on which if you had a naval opinion it might be of great value, but the question of whether it is necessary to begin young in order to become a good seaman is a question on which naval opinion differs. Anyone who has read the old debates in this House knows that no two naval men hold the same opinion on it.

One of the brightest names in the annals of the British Navy is that of Lord Dundonald, but he entered the Navy at eighteen years of age, or about the period of the second stage under the new scheme. What is this sea-character which cannot be acquired unless you catch your seaman at the age of twelve and a half years? Does it apply to all seamen? Does it apply to the mercantile marine? Does it apply to all the men in the Fleet? The ordinary seaman comes in at eighteen, from which it appears that the sea-character is a thing which does not concern the ordinary seaman at all, but is special and peculiar to the officer. But supposing it to be confined to the officer, has it ever been contended to be necessary in the case of marines or engineers? Or, to adopt the argument of the hon. Member for King's Lynn, do you now, in justification of this proposal, allege that the true sea-character has never been acquired by the marine or engineer officer? I do not believe that anybody who knows the Navy would venture to take up such a position as that. These boys will not get sea-life, and how they are to get sea-character at a land college is one of the mysteries which have not been explained, either by the First Lord of the Admiralty in his Memorandum, or by the Secretary to the Admiralty in his speech to-day. Confining myself to the alleged necessity of fixing the age at twelve and a half years, I would ask what reliance can be placed on the supposed preference of a boy of that age for a naval career? Can you trust the preference of such a lad as you would trust the deliberate preference of a young man who has been thinking about the matter for four years more, and who at the age of seventeen, after considering all possible careers, makes up his mind for the Navy? If you asked my opinion, I should say, choose the more, rather than the less matured judgment, and I regard that as one strong argument against the adoption of the earlier age.

To go back to the preparatory stage, in the course you are going to give them for the first four years there will be, and cannot be anything else, but a good secondary education. You cannot give them anything more than that; you may base it largely on science—in my humble judgment all education ought to be based on science, and I approve of all the Admiralty propose as to that—but you cannot give them anything more than a secondary education. Therefore I would say, instead of taking them at twelve and a half years and condemning them, as you will be condemning them, to a naval career, fix your requirements by declaration, say that boys must know something of the principle of marine engineering and the physical sciences, and take them at the age of sixteen or seventeen when an examination can be a reality, and you may rest assured that the public school system will produce the training which will yield the results you desire. After carefully considering the whole question, I have come to the conclusion that the alleged necessity for cadets entering at this early age has not been and cannot be proved. I believe the adoption of the early age is not the consequence of any such necessity at all, but it has been favoured in order to build upon it a system of patronage and exclusive appointments. Even if it were proved to me, as it has not been, that there are advantages in the selection of the earlier age, I say that it is paying too high a price for those advantages to adopt a system which excludes from the service of the Navy 95 per cent. of the brain and muscle of the eligible candidates who might be willing to adopt a naval career. The effect of this scheme will be the complete exclusion of all but a privileged class from the Navy, which all pay for, and which belongs, not to the Admiralty or to naval officers, but to the people of the country at large. We can to some extent judge the probable effects by the results of the system in the Army. Coarser methods are there applied, but they have the same object in view. We have in the Army what are called "crack" regiments; I hope we shall never have in the Navy "crack" ships, in the fashionable sense in which the word is used. In the debate to which reference has been made, Lord Goschen spoke; he was then First Lord of the Admiralty, and this is the principle he laid down—

> "The naval service must be open to all classes of the people."

Lord Goschen has no doubt changed his opinion on many subjects, but I doubt if he has changed it on this, and I hope that before the scheme becomes an accomplished fact the late First Lord will have something to say about the proposals of his successor.

Allusion has been made to the late Member for Woolwich. Lord Charles Beresford is an excellent example of the kind of naval candidate who obtains easy admission to, and rapid promotion in, the Navy. He has been succeeded in this House by an hon. Member of a very different type, representing unknown forces, and probably, to some, unwelcome opinions. I shall look with interest to see how the successor of Lord Charles Beresford votes upon the first question submitted to him. In the name of the Crown, the Admiralty come to the hon. Member and say: "This Navy, for which we ask £36,000,000, must be supported by taxes on the bread, tea, and sugar of the people, but we state frankly to the class to which you belong, practically the whole of your constituents, that though their sons may be stokers, artificers, and perhaps warrant officers in the Navy, we are going to take care, by this new system, that it shall be impossible for them ever to become officers." That is the question placed before the hon. Member, and I have very little doubt as to how he will vote upon it.

Reference has been made to certain articles in *The Times* newspaper. I always read the naval articles in *The Times* with more interest than any other part of that remarkable organ of the powerful, wealthy, and privileged classes of this country. In one of those articles a gentleman, defending the scheme, has the assurance to say that under these new proposals dukes' sons and cooks' sons will come into the Navy on equal terms. That is what men who have not examined the scheme say.

But while I am supporting his Motion, I do not take the same view of other parts of the scheme as the hon. Member for King's Lynn. I do not believe that the grievances of the engineers are of such a character that they can be bought off by a payment of money; that things are as they ought to be, and that all you have to do to satisfy the engineers is to add 10 per cent. or 20 per cent. to their salaries. Therefore, though I have attacked the scheme on the grounds that I have mentioned, it must not be supposed that I concur with the hon. Member opposite in what has been the main body of his criticism. I agree rather with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, that, while the exclusion of competition and the establishment of patronage is the one big thing concerning the scheme upon which the House has to pass judgment, there are other questions, also difficult, involving other considerations. What is to be the effect of this scheme on the Navy as a whole; and, in particular, what are the prospects of what is called the "interchangeability" of officers? On that point I should like to have naval opinion. On a question of that sort, naval opinion would be most important if we could only get it; but we have not got it, and I am afraid there will be some difficulty in getting it. The question of interchangeability is manifestly a difficult one, and there are two questions I should like to ask. You are going to make the marine executive and the engineers all one. After what has been said, I think some statement ought to be made on the question of the *status* of the marines. If you are going to mix the officers up, I suppose there will be a certain fusion in the lower ranks also, and I should like to hear what the hon. Gentleman has to say on the question of whether it is at all necessary to keep up the separate organisation of the marines on board ship.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That question does not now arise.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The suggestion was to make them all one, and I suggested as a deduction from that that some explanation might be necessary why they do not go further and abolish the distinction altogether as far as the marines are concerned.

*MR. SPEAKER: That question does not arise. It may be somewhat remotely connected, with the subject of the Amendment, but it cannot be discussed.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: It would be necessary to know what are the special functions of this special class. But there is another question. There will be grave difficulties in the transition period between the officers of the old system and the officers of the new system. There must be friction of some sort between the officers and engineers of the old and new system. All these things want considering. The main question, however, which the House has to consider to-day is the one with which I began, namely, are we, for the sake of an unproved advantage and an unprovable advantage, and for the sake of bringing officers into the Navy at an age far lower than usual, to establish a system which removes them, so far as the officers are concerned, entirely from the main bulk, which destroys competition, which will have an evil effect, and which will produce no advantage to the country or to the Navy. I agree with the Amendment to this extent, that in destroying the principle of public competition, and in establishing the principle of favouritism and exclusiveness, the Admiralty has gone too far; the Government ought never to have taken up this scheme or proceeded with it without the assent of Parliament, and I declare my confirmed and determined opposition to that part of the scheme to which I have referred.

*MR. HALDANE (Haddington): It was obvious during the earlier part of this debate that the support that Government might get for this scheme from their own followers would be a divided support. It is pretty obvious that upon this side of the House also there is a good deal of division of opinion. My hon. and learned friend who has just sat down has made a powerful speech about the scheme, and he has done great public service by calling attention to one matter connected with it, and that is the large extent to which patronage is put at the disposition of the naval authorities. That is an important point, no doubt, but I have been deeply moved by different considerations connected with this scheme, turning on another point which seems to be equally vital. I agree with my hon. and learned friend that it is a question of balancing difficulty against difficulty, and that the burden is upon those who say the change must be made. The point I have in my mind is one which leads me to think very strongly that this scheme is a very good one and goes to the root of the matter. The complaint, as my hon. and learned friend has put it, against this scheme is that it should be deemed necessary to bring officers into the Navy at an earlier age than is at present the case, and he argues that there is no reason why these officers should not be rendered fit for the Navy at a later stage in life. But, Sir, if there is one thing about which there has been strong feeling of late, and one topic upon which there has been more agreement than upon any other, it is the unfortunate fact that most of our Admirals are comparatively old men. The conditions of the service which control the promotion of officers in our Navy are such as to give high rank at a far later stage than ought to be the case if you are to get complete efficiency. The ages of the admirals in the German Navy are on an average some ten years less than those of our own admirals. Now, Sir, I am not saying that we have not had some magnificent service from elderly men in our Navy, and I hope that we shall continue to have such magnificent service in the future. I do, however, say that it is a bad thing, when everything depends upon quickness and daring, upon judgment and courage, and upon those qualities which you do not often find in men who have passed the prime of life—I do say that it is a misfortune that we should have a system which of necessity compels these admirals to be kept back from exercising their supreme functions until a stage has been reached when they are past the prime of ife. On that ground alone I should say it was a material advantage to reduce the age at which officers should be able to join the Navy.

SIR JOHN GORST: The German age is not an earlier age.

*MR. HALDANE: No, but the German admiral age is much earlier. I am aware that the German naval cadets enter later, because they have to go through the secondary school system, but I was under the impression that our Navy was a model, and that we meant to be very much ahead of Germany as far as the quality of our officers is concerned. I do not think anybody can form a just judgment of the scheme without looking at what the problem is which the Admiralty has to solve. I agree with my hon. and learned friend that there has been great dissatisfaction on the part of the engineer branch of the Service, but that is not the only matter, nor is it the most serious one. As time has gone on, the work of the average naval officer, whether he be an executive officer or an engineer, has gradually become of a more and more technical character, demanding more and more complete training, and calling for a combination not only of various qualities, but of kinds of knowledge which cannot be got unless the education is of a very much more thorough character than it was in the good old times.

Two qualities have been called for. The hon. Member for King's Lynn, in the fine old crusted speech in which he complained of the influence of the Liberal Unionists, desires us to go back to a former state of things, to those old traditions about our midshipmen who used to command cutters at a very early age, and did so very efficiently, with a plenitude of language which usually belongs to a much later stage in life. No doubt that sort of sea quality is very valuable, but, on the other hand, you are now calling for increased scientific knowledge, increased training, and better education for young officers. How are you to combine those qualities? It is for the want of the combination that the existing system has broken down. The average boy who comes from the public schools has not been properly trained when he arrives at fifteen or sixteen years of age, and he has not got that kind of quality which the old midshipman used to get. The kind of training which the young officer has to go through does not make up for the deficiences which the school training necessarily has. We have now passed away from the kind of education afforded by masts and yard-arms, which made a seaman of a young officer very fast, and we have got back to a condition of things in which scientific knowledge is most important, and which must yet be acquired in a sea atmosphere.

Now the Admiralty are face to face with this problem. The battleship, the cruiser, the torpedo destroyer, or whatever it is you are dealing with, is getting more and more of a scientific instrument. and is getting to be a vessel in which every part is co-ordinated, and in which no man can command the whole unless he has a knowledge of every part. The executive officer must to some extent be an engineer. I disagree with the hon. Member for King's Lynn that a man can separate the two capacities, or be a good controller of machinery, without knowing in detail how to deal with it. Your executive officer must have some knowledge of engineering if he is to be really first rate on board a battleship or cruiser. Your Marine officer and others are, on the other hand, at present cut off altogether from the kind of naval surroundings which they ought to have if they are to be brought into relation with other duties. The purpose of the Admiralty in this scheme is, if possible. to provide a type of naval officer who will have all this kind of knowledge when he begins his career, and then, and not till then, will they allow him to differentiate. I see no difficulty in a man of nineteen or twenty having sufficient knowledge of engineering to be an expert in the art of understanding and controlling the ship's engines, and I see no difficulty in such an expert also having the general knowledge which an executive officer ought to have. Let anybody interested in these things watch the young officers who are being trained to work the torpedoes at Portsmouth on board the "Vernon.' Whether it be torpedo work, or wireless telegraphy, or any other technical subject taught on the training ships, you will see at every turn the necessity which is growing for the naval officer understanding every branch of the science which is necessary for the handling of a ship. Whether you are dealing with gunnery, torpedoes, the engines, or the electricity which is the motive power right through the ship, or with the liquid air which is likely to be of such importance in the future on board our warships, all these things require scientific knowledge, which must be possessed by every kind of officer. That is the problem the Admiralty have to face.

I dissent from the view that this is a problem which has arisen merely out of the discontent of the engineer officer. I feel that it is due to the growth of our time and the great change that has come over the tremendous instruments of war which science has made necessary if we are to hold our own in the competition of the world. The problem which the Admiralty has had to face is to provide a system under which officers can begin earlier to acquire their knowledge. The situation was—that the public school had made the endeavour to furnish young men who would come up at the end of their secondary education and compete for entry into a short service. That has been found to be insufficient, and accordingly the Admiralty have formed the design of reverting to a different kind of training, under which the officers begin at an early age in order to produce this interchangeable and highly trained kind of officer. This is no new idea, because this kind of officer exists already in the United States, where he had been a great success. I must say that I was strongly impressed by the opinion of certain of the naval authorities of the United States, who gave nothing but praise to this scheme so far as in operation across the Atlantic. But how are you going to produce this kind of man unless you give him longer training than three or four years? You must take him at an early age. If you are to begin at the first four years of his professional life, between twelve and twelve and a half years of age, you must begin by instilling into him something of seamanship. It is said that these four years are to be passed at a college on land. I am not sure if I have read the scheme in the same way as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University—there is to be a naval college, but there is to be training in marine appliances and ship appliances.

Sir JOHN GORST: Marine engines.

*Mr. HALDANE: I believe there will be war ships provided for giving instruction; there is to be a ship in which these boys will be trained, and in which they will be in contact with naval officers through that period of their career. I do not interpret the scheme in the restricted sense in which the right hon. Gentleman interprets it, and it turns out that my interpretation is the right one, for I see nodded assent from those gentlemen on the other side of the House who are responsible for the scheme. The idea is to bring the boy into a naval atmosphere and give him there the beginnings of a first-rate secondary education. He will begin at twelve, when his primary education is done. The secondary education adopted for naval purposes is one which he may make use of for other purposes if he fails in the examination, or for any other reason does not qualify for the Service. You are going, as I read the new scheme, really to start a very good new school. The right hon. Gentleman referred to the failure of an attempt of this nature on board the "Britannia." That, I think, is probably very true. It is a quarter of a century since that time, and we come to this matter now with superior wisdom. I trust it is within the capacity of the Admiralty nowadays to organise a good secondary school of this special type, because, if not, then I should begin to doubt their efficiency for Admiralty purposes in which, up to the present time, I have been very much disposed to believe. I think it is possible to start a first-rate school of this kind. It entirely depends on whom you get to manage it. Our naval people have proved themselves, in other spheres, sufficiently handy and adaptable to make me believe that they are sufficiently handy and adaptable to bring themselves into line with educational experts in this matter. Then, after these four years, it is alleged against the scheme that it is by no means certain that there will be any real good training on board ship. There, again, the Admiralty Memorandum is somewhat sketchy, but I find nothing to exclude the notion that every encouragement will be given to the young cadet getting into the second stage on board ship so that he may thoroughly apply himself to the study of his profession. It is not going to be a continuation school. The Admiralty in that matter have left themselves a good deal of elasticity, and it will be their duty to see that the course of training for the four years is carried out in a more specialised naval form in the next three years. If that is not done, it will be the duty of this House to call them to account, and some of us who are interested in this matter will follow it with a great deal of attention. There you have seven years of what ought to be, if the general principles which are laid down in this Paper are carried out, first-rate secondary education specialised as such education ought to be specialised in the view to the subsequent career of the officer. The science that is taught in the ordinary public school is taught generally without specialisation, whereas here you have a class of school which is designed to produce a particular kind of mind in the trained officer. I welcome that on educational grounds. What is it that we have been complaining of in this country except the deficiency of specialised secondary schools? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University has been the keenest critic of the absence of the provision of specialised secondary schools, and he has told us over and over again that we stopped short at the end of elementary education.

SIR JOHN GORST: I never advocated specialisation at so early an age as twelve.

*MR. HALDANE: The point of the age is another matter; but the right hon. Gentleman knows that in the German secondary schools he admires so much the specialisation begins with the cleverer boys at this age. You are adopting that age which has been adopted in Scotland, and certainly ought to be adopted in England, as the time for beginning secondary education. I say that as the officer is to be a high scientific person in future, he must be trained in that fashion if you are to do any good. I am glad in the interest of education in this country that the Admiralty, which seems to be an enterprising body, is giving the whole cause of education a lift by teaching how to organise a specialised kind of schools.

I now come to the most formidable point made against the scheme. My hon. and learned friend the Member for Dundee has touched upon a point which I do think involves a disagreeable element, the predominance of the nomination system. I am glad to see that effect is given to my first conclusion that you must begin at this early age if you are to do the work thoroughly, although we may agree or disagree as to the methods. I have given the reasons which convey to my mind strong conviction on the subject. But if you are to begin at so early an age as twelve you cannot have competitive examinations. I think they are ridiculous at that time. I think my hon. friend took that view. What he says is that you have not proved your case for the earlier age. If it were possible to get this training begun at sixteen or eighteen, certainly put it in the form of competition, as we put as many other matters in that form when entering the public service as possible, but if you cannot defer it without sacrificing efficiency, then I think we should be wrong if we sacrificed the Navy to the principle of competition.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: This scheme contemplates competition.

*MR. HALDANE: The system, as I understand the Memorandum, is this—the First Lord will nominate, and there will be a certain number of nominations by persons connected with the Navy. There will be slightly more candidates than there are vacancies to fill.

SIR JOHN GORST: The scheme says that the present system is to go on, and there will be competition. The present system is to nominate three times the number for which there are vacancies, and the selection is by competitive examination.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: That is an entire misapprehension. There is no intention of following the old system of nominating largely in excess of the vacancies.

SIR JOHN GORST: May I call attention to one clause in this Memorandum?

MR. SPEAKER: I think this is rather an irregular discussion.

*MR. HALDANE: I certainly do not read the new scheme as contemplating the nomination of three times the number that are wanted. I read it to mean that you are to nominate a certain number, and then, having regard to the number you are able to employ, you would be able by examination from time to time — the scheme does not go into details — to knock off those who are insufficiently equipped or objectionable on other grounds. We have got exactly that system in every public school. You have an examination by which boys go from form to form. And the examination test is not a perfect one. I am glad to see that in the United States there is rapidly growing a demand for higher and more searching educational tests. I am bound to say that this scheme is rather sketchy, and I shall be glad to hear what the details consist of. The knocking off of those who are not wanted for the second part of the course of training involves, of course, an invidious duty on the part of the naval authorities, and I should like to have an assurance that this, as well as the initial nomination, will be done in the most public possible way—that the lists of those who applied for nomination, as well as of those who have gone in for examination, will be published, and that the lists of those who have gained will also be published. If it is impossible to make everything public, at least let what is done be done, as far as possible, in the light of day. Let us take every security that there shall not be any jobbery connected with it. With the present First Lord of the Admiralty, and with Lord Spencer, who held that office in the late Government, I should not have the smallest fear of favouritism, but one never knows whether, from this side of the House or the other, there may not come somebody not so distinguished as a purist as these two men, and I wish to take guarantees that we shall be able to bring criticism to bear if we think there has been any case of undue favouritism. I should like a democratic profession in the sense that it should be open to everyone, but I am not prepared to sacrifice anything in the Navy to competitive examination. Therefore the difficulty will have to be got over in another way. I hope we will have guarantees now, or at a later stage, as to the fashion in which we are to have these nominations.

I have taken part in this debate, and support the scheme from two points of view. First, because the Navy has got to become more and more effective in that kind of organisation for which we claim predominance, of which we are proud, and in which we desire to be an example to the rest of the world. Secondly, because in this scheme there is an educational lesson to the rest of the nation engaged in other pursuits. On these two grounds, speaking for myself and reserving the liberty to criticise the details, some of which we do not know, I am, for my part, prepared to give my approval to the scheme.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley): The mover of the Amendment based his attack on the fact that candidates were to enter at a later age than hitherto, whereas the seconder and others have based their views on entirely contradictory grounds, viz., that candidates will enter the Navy at a very much later stage, and it is not necessary that a sea-going officer should enter young. I venture to think that the matter could not remain where it was, and that the great upheaval that has arisen from the Memorandum of the First Lord of the Admiralty was absolutely inevitable. What was the condition of things before? It was that the engineer force of the Navy had become more and more important; the work of the officers in the engineering branch had become baulked because of the paucity of candidates, and of the difficulty of replacing the natural wastage of engineering officers. That difficulty could not have been overcome by merely increasing the pay of engineer officers. They have as much *esprit de corps* as any other officers in the Fleet, and they desire that their position should be recognised, and that the important duties which they perform — the fact that they have the responsible discipline of over one-third of the ship's company—should be made clear, and their position improved accordingly. I heard with great regret the statements of the hon. Member for King's Lynn. They were not worthy of any one of real understanding of Naval affairs and real experience of the requirements of His Majesty's Fleet. It is not a question of mere monopolies; it is not a question alone of the management of one-third of the ships' companies; nor is it a question alone of discipline or the starting or stopping of an engine to order, but at the moment of difficulty, at the time of the breakdown of machinery, of the inevitable accident which must occur in times of peace, and are certain to occur in times of war—what are the attainments of the men you require? You must have them able to restore that machinery to its working condition, and to put right that which has gone wrong. The life of the engine-driver on land, with a skilled engineer who supervises him, has no relation whatever to the life of the engineer at sea. The latter has to depend upon his own resources, and he may be hundreds of miles away from those who have superior knowledge and responsibilities. Therefore, you must have in your naval engineer, knowledge, culture, and scientific skill, equal in most respects to the higher class engineer on land. Such are absolute necessities to one rising to the highest position in the Navy.

The difficulty I have in supporting this scheme is some doubt as to whether the age that is proposed, of, I think, nineteen or twenty years, for the young aspirant to engineering to commence his workshop experience is early enough. The hon. Member for Gateshead, who thoroughly understands the question of engineers, will no doubt agree with me that a lad cannot too early commence his workshop practice, and if that is obtained at too late a period of life, the young engineer will not acquire that knowledge which is essential for the proper discharge of his duties later on in life. Whether the suggestion that the period at which the aspirant shall go to the workshop may be accelerated commends itself to the Secretary to the Admiralty, and those whom he so well represents, I cannot say, but I think, if it be possible to arrange the workshop practice to commence at an earlier age in the engineering branch, that it will make for more practical knowledge and greater efficiency of the engineers in the future. Something has been said of the non-democratic character of this scheme. I believe you will find that it will produce a class of officers in the Navy which will correspond very largely, both socially and in other respects, with the Royal Engineers in the Army. It is well known that sons of parents of moderate means may take up positions in the Royal Engineers and live on their own pay. I believe that military hon. Gentlemen, familiar with Army affairs, will bear me out in saying that the only corps in the Army in which an officer can live on his pay is the Royal Engineers. I believe, in like manner, you will find a class of officers will grow up in the Royal Navy who will be of that class. For that reason I think it will be found necessary and desirable that the higher rate of pay shall be given to all correspondingly of equal rank.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is now going into a topic outside the Amendment which deals with the training of officers. He is going into the general position of certain officers in the Service.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: Then, Sir, I will not go into the question of pay. It was said by the right hon. Gentleman below me that you cannot combine in your officers the executive, the marine, and the engineering branches. But it is the very essence of the scheme that at nineteen or twenty years of age you specialise. You make your aspirant select either the executive branch, the marine branch, or the engineering branch. From nineteen or twenty years his education is limited, so far as speciality is concerned, to one or other of these branches. Then there is the question of competition. According to the scheme, it is understood by those who have carefully read the Memorandum that the system of competition is continued. It exists in the first stage, and it certainly exists towards the secondary stage, when the decision of the aspirant as to which line of the Navy he will enter has to be taken. As I read the Memorandum, the choice will be given by the Admiralty Board on the basis of confidential reports and the results of competition. Now, I challenge with absolute certainty the allegation of the hon. Member for Dundee that the humbler classes will be shut out from the officers of the Navy. The Secretary to the Admiralty told us in his speech to-day that sixty warrant officers would be promoted to commission rank.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I was referring to those who began their naval career as officers, not to those who rose.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: I quite agree; but there are to-day, and will continue under this scheme, two means by which it is possible to rise to become Admiral of the Fleet. One through the midshipman, or by whatever way it is the custom, by the old or new schemes, for young lads entering the Navy with a view to being trained as officers, and the other, by which men of the lower deck, rising from the position of warrant officers, may attain. And just as that possibility exists to-day, as shown by these sixty promotions, so I believe it will continue under the new scheme. I have no hesitation in supporting this new scheme from the point of view of the engineers. I believe the existing engineers accept it as a reasonable and proper solution of the question, and I regard it as a wise and beneficial reform.

*MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): The hon. Member for Shipley has pointed out to us the many qualifications required and desired in an effective engineer officer; but he has failed to show in any way why students who are going to follow that branch of the profession should be called upon to come to a naval school at twelve years of age. Although I think there is much in the scheme that is good, my first and great objection to it is that raised by the right hon. the Member for Cambridge University, viz., the cutting off of young children of twelve years of age from their natural home life that is open to an ordinary boy, and the loss of which is so thoroughly disastrous. The plea of the Admiralty is that they want to get something by better training than they have now; but the very worst way of securing that is by appealing to the old traditions of the sea, which are that you can only get efficiency by catching the officer young. I believe that the open door at the age of seventeen would be far more conducive to the best brains coming to the Navy, when the competitive system of examination could be applied with beneficial results and without injury. All medical authority points to the fact that any attempt to compel young children to undergo competitive examinations is positively hurtful to their future prospects and career. If we are going to take into the future nursery of the Navy, as raw material, a collection of young children, who are not to be subject practically to any test when they come in, but who are to be subsequently liable to the mortification—in which their parents would share—of being weeded out, I doubt very much whether many parents would assent to send their children under these conditions. It is very easy to tell us that it would only be the elimination of the unfit, but when children return to their home associations thus weeded out, they would suffer from the stigma of dismissal. The fact is that by taking the children too young it is impossible to test their merits, and thus many who under other conditions who choose this career are destined to be lost to the service. I have another objection to this early entry, which could be better met by an open competition at seventeen years of age, and that is, that the latter system would save the country from undertaking the responsibilities of their scholastic education, and also from the considerable expense necessarily involved. The number of students in the "Britannia" is at present about 280; but it is estimated that under the new scheme they would be 480; and taking the cost to the State as £125 per annum for each student, these additional numbers alone would mean an additional cost to the State of about £25,000 a year. If the entry were made at seventeen years of age there would be a much wider and superior selection, provided the Admiralty let it be known what class of education would be required at that age. Then at the age of seventeen the constitution, character, and capacity of the youths would be known, which could not possibly be the case with boys of twelve. The hon. and learned Member for Haddington appealed to the great advantages of the children being educated in a naval atmosphere, but I do not think they cou'd be satisfactorily educated, and at the same time pick up as he suggests a secondary education on board a cruiser—even if they had the capacity. They would require the whole of the four years to be devoted exclusively to education. The Admiralty seemed to have made up their mind very suddenly to a particular class of reform, as affecting all entries irrespective of cadets, and when once they seized hold of it they would never let it go. Not only are the Admiralty about to train all their officers from these young children, but they are also determined to train all their artisan ratings from boys, and will not in future apply to the open market. Already they have started building up their naval shipwright ratings from young boys whom they have taken in to train; they are now going to train engine-room artificers from boys also; and very soon the outside skilled working man, or the young apprentice trained outside, will no longer be asked to come into the Navy, which will cease to offer him any career whatever. I think myself that that is dangerous. I think that the outside supply should always be kept going, as certainly the engineer establishments of the country have many advantages over the establishments controlled by the Admiralty, in this respect, that the equipment outside is very much better than the equipment at present possessed by Government establishments, although, no doubt, it is undergoing much improvement.

There are a few questions I should like to ask. As regards the Royal Marines, I am glad that they are no longer to be treated, as the Secretary to the Admiralty once expressed it, as the fifth wheel of the coach, but are to have in future a definite recognition. I wish to ask whether they are to have a direct representation on the Board of Admiralty. Nobody emphasised the necessity for that more strongly than the Secretary to the Admiralty when he was in a position of greater freedom and less responsibility. I also want to ask, and this is a matter I have raised many times in this House, whether marine officers are to be allowed to sit on courts-martial when afloat. There, again, I could quote some very pungent language of the Secretary to the Admiralty when he was sitting below the Gangway only three years ago. Now that changes are going to be brought about, and that the status of the Royal Marines is to be improved, I wish to

ask whether these two very important matters are going to be considered. I would also wish to know what is to be the concession as regards the rates of pay of Marine officers.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is now going beyond the question raised by the Amendment.

*MR. KEARLEY: With all respect, Sir, I submit that this is part and parcel of the scheme as adumbrated in the Memorandum of the First Lord of the Admiralty.

*MR. SPEAKER: The Amendment refers only to the scheme of naval training embodied in the Memorandum. It does not refer to everything in the Memorandum.

*MR. KEARLEY: On a point of order, Sir, I would submit that under this new scheme the position of Marines will be altogether different; and that these are questions which affect the future status of the Marines.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman cannot proceed with that matter now.

*MR. KEARLEY: In conclusion, I should like to explain that if I have to give a vote, I shall give it against the Government, not because I disagree with the entire scheme, but solely on the ground that I object to the early age of entry. My vote must be understood to mean that and nothing more. I am very glad to see that concessions are to be made to the warrant officers, for which some of us have worked hard during the last ten years. The very first speech I made in this House was to bring forward that particular grievance, which was embodied in what was called "The Warrant Officers' Earnest Appeal." I am certain that it is a good thing to give these sixty commissions to warrant officers, and to advance them to the position of lieutenants. It is not, of course, substantive rank. I am myself in favour of the democratic ideal that every position, from the lowest to the highest, should be open. I am afraid we shall have to wait many years for that, but we are thankful for small concessions as they come along. Another old grievance aired in this House by myself and others, is to be remedied by the concession to the chief petty officers. It only shows that the matters which we have brought forward have had a general element of justice connected with them, as is evidenced by the fact that in course of time they have been conceded, although they may have been originally discounted.

The only other remark I desire to make has reference to the transition stage. The men trained under the new scheme will not really take charge of our Fleet for at least a quarter of a century. That is to say, the cadets entering to-day will not be captains for twenty-five years, so that there will be a long interregnum. Therefore, the Admiralty will be well advised to build as much of the new as they can to the old; so that there may be at the right moment a fusion between those serving under the old conditions and those who will be overlapping them, as it were, under the new conditions. It will be interesting to learn from the hon. Gentleman the system by which it is proposed to blend the old system into the new. There are difficulties, no doubt, in this transition stage; but if we are to have a successful scientific Navy, it is urgently necessary to bring this new system of training to bear on the old. Putting aside the strong objections I have to the early age of entry, I wish the Admiralty well; and I have no desire myself to be an opponent of the scheme, except as regards that part of it.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I venture to interrupt at this stage, because I think that inasmuch as there may be many other points cropping up, it will be convenient to deal with them as we go along. I venture to think that generally speaking the discussion has been moderate, helpful, and useful. But I do not know that I can apply these words to the speech of the hon. Member for King's Lynn in moving the Amendment. The speech was a disappointment to me, and gained nothing in my opinion from the personal discourtesies which it contained. There was nothing in that speech which minimised the value of our new scheme for the teaching of officers. My hon. friend asked what had made the necessity of the scheme so suddenly apparent to the Admiralty. I should have thought the answer to that was plain enough. This year coincides with the conclusion of one distinct epoch of our naval system—the epoch which witnessed the change from masts and sails to steam; and I should think that that in itself is sufficient proof that the time has come for the adoption of different methods of teaching. If I may say so, I think it is almost childish for my hon. friend to suggest that the decision of the present Board of Admiralty to institute an alteration in the system of teaching is a reproach upon former Boards for not having made the change. My hon. friend spoke of Boards of Admiralty of fifteen and sixteen years ago, and suggested that because they did not do what we are doing we condemn them as inefficient and incompetent. But the whole process of the Admiralty is one of evolution, and must always be one of evolution; and if every change that is made in our naval system implies the condemnation of the Boards that had gone before, little will ever be done for the advantage of the Fleet. I agree with my hon. friend in one matter of which he spoke, the position of what he calls our engine-drivers on board ship, though I do not agree with all he says. The scheme does not propose, as my hon. friend has suggested, that every officer in the engineering branch of the service should be a highly qualified engineer. I agree it is not necessary, and it is just because of that that this scheme of training proposes to give a scientific education to a small number of engineer officers. We believe that in a great scientific service like the Navy there is ample room, and must always be ample room, and need for engineers of the highest scientific attainments, but we do not propose that the superintendent of every engine-room shall necessarily be a man possessed of these high qualifications.

Coming to the point which my right hon. friend emphasised with so much force, and which was taken up by my hon. friend opposite, I can assure my hon. friend the Member for Dundee that the arguments he has advanced against the lowering of the age of entrance for officers have been fully considered and discussed by the Board of

Admiralty. When forming its conclusions let me remind the House what the points are. In the first place there is the suggestion that you ought not to take the boys so young—what my right hon. friend calls little boys—and he adduces the arguments of the late Lord Ramsay in support of that contention. But it is not really a question between the ages of twelve and a half years on the one hand, and fourteen and a half years on the other. The point is whether in the Navy you are going to take boys young or old educationally? I hope no one is going to contend that the system Lord Ramsay suggested——

SIR JOHN GORST: He advocated the age of seventeen.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I think he was a member of the Board which suggested that the age of fourteen and a half should be adopted on board the "Britannia," and it was hoped at the time the age of fourteen and a half years was adopted that the Navy would get the best boys the public schools could produce. But we have not got the best out of the public schools, for the boys are taken away just as they are beginning to obtain the real value of the training in public schools. I do not think anybody is going to dispute the failure of the system of taking boys at fourteen and a half, and, therefore, you have got to decide whether you will make the age of entry eighteen, as my hon. friend opposite suggests, or twelve as we suggest.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I meant the second stage.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: That is sixteen. I think there you would be breaking right into the middle of their public school career. At the age of sixteen he would be just in the middle of his public school career. I can see arguments in favour of entering at eighteen years of age, but I cannot see any in favour of entering at sixteen. But my right hon. friend said why segregate them? Why are you going to give them scholastic education on a ship? There will be no similarity between the Naval College at Osborne, as we intend to establish it, and the "Britannia" as my right hon. friend describes it. The "Britannia" is a school where the course is about eighteen months, and consists of four terms, and where the scholastic subjects are principally taught. There will be two cruisers attached to the College at Osborne, and both at the Naval College at Osborne and on the "Britannia" these boys will receive just that training which will be of most value to young naval officers. There will be machines and appliances for instructing the boys, as far as boys of that age can be instructed, and they can be taught a great deal, in the use of tools and mechanical appliances. They will have their steam launch in which they will go to sea; they will also be taught languages and such other knowledge as is being imparted on the "Britannia." The course will be a three or four years' course, and we shall make it, as we believe, a thoroughly sound and organised training which will be of value to every boy who goes through it. Although we propose to impose practically only a qualifying examination for entering, we desire to introduce much more severe and serious examinations at various stages in the boy's career.

An hon. Member opposite said he did not believe that public opinion would tolerate or concede the introduction of the new principle of allowing boys to be eliminated after they had once entered. But it is not a new principle. It exists at Woolwich, where, as far as I know, it has never been cavilled at, and it exists, in fact, on the "Britannia." But if it be regarded as in any sense invidious at the present time, it will cease to be so when it is understood that it is to be applied as a regular principle after examinations at certain fixed intervals. If it happens that a boy is found not to be physically or mentally capable, or not to have the necessary taste for the service, and is compelled to leave the "Britannia" at any point, he will at any rate be able to prosecute his studies in a public or private school, or in any other direction, with an amount of knowledge and training that he would hardly obtain at equal cost or with equal facilities in any other institution in the United Kingdom. It has been said that you might take these boys from any public school, secondary school, or board school. I will not say a word against what those schools might give; perhaps I am rather sceptical about the knowledge imparted in public schools at the present time. What I will say is that, take the best of them or take the worst of them, I am confident that for naval purposes not one of them can give in two years the amount of knowledge of the kind we require that we should be able to give in one year under our new scheme.

I will deal with one other important question—that of nomination. I do not complain at all of the introduction of that question. On the contrary, I think it would have been a very grave mistake if the debate had been allowed to close without that subject being brought up. It is a very serious thing indeed that for any reason, however good, we should limit in any way the avenues to one of the great public services. But I ask the House whether they do not think the reasons we are able to adduce are good? My hon. friend said that this was an undemocratic arrangement. I object to accepting that as a conclusive argument, though I know he regards the circumstance of any institution being democratic as *per se* a recommendation. But I agree with him that it is desirable as far as possible to get the whole sweep of national life into any great national concern, but the moment you depart from the principle of open competition you must come to some system of this kind. This is nothing new. For many a year we have obtained our naval officers by this principle of nomination. That is no argument in itself, but I ask the House to consider whether we have been well or ill served? Is it true to say that wealth dominates the selections for the Navy, that wealth has acquired an undue influence in the ships, and that only the wealthy have got on in the Navy? I believe that the answer to every one of those points is in the negative. I can bear testimony to the fact that, I do not say the poorest of the poor, but that many men and women who are really poor, have sent their sons into the Navy to the great advantage of the State and of the Service.

A point may be made in respect of the fact that we are eliminating the sources of entry through the Royal Marines and the Engineers. I do not know whether hon. Members are aware how very slight is the real difference between the cost of the engineering education in the Navy and that of a cadet in the executive line. There is a difference of £35 a year, but, as the "Britannia" course lasts only four terms, while the course at Keyham lasts five years, it is not possible by taking the figures for one year to make a comparison between the two. I think it will be found that the difference is very slight indeed. My hon. friend says that this is an undemocratic proceeding, but if that be so I think I have already shown that it is a proceeding which has received the sanction of innumerable Parliaments, and, what is more important, it has received the *imprimatur* of national approval and the approval of the naval service. If the system is anti-democratic, why is it not scouted and abandoned by the countries professing to be ultra-democratic? With a single exception every navy has found it necessary to exercise some sort of control over the appointment of naval officers. In France, where there is open competition, the result is that they were recently twenty short of the number of officers required, and had to nominate subordinate officers to fill up the vacancies. Is entry into the United States Navy governed by competition? Not at all. How is it fixed? The United States Navy is officered by nomination. And who nominates? Perhaps it will be said by the hon. Member that the system there is better than our own and gives a better choice. We trust the nominations, for good or for evil, to the Board of Admiralty, which is responsible for the welfare of the Navy. In the United States the nominations are entrusted to individual Members of Congress. My view is that nothing at all would be gained for the Navy if every single Member of this House were given a nomination and was bound to attach it to one particular county in the United Kingdom. I mention this not as deriding the United States system, with which I had nothing to do, but as showing that it is not easy to modify the system of nomination. It will have to be accepted in the future as in the past, unless some much stronger reason for its abandonment is shown, as the inevitable consequence of the relinquishment of competition in the earliest stage of the officer's career. My hon. friend the Member for the Shipley Division was in some doubt as to whether the instruction we are giving is sufficient.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the hon. Gentleman tell us whether the scheme generally will be the same as before.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: There will be nomination of a sufficient number of candidates for the vacancies, with an addition which will cover waste through failure to pass the medical examination, through failure to qualify, and through cadets proving unsuitable afterwards. I am conscious of the gaps in the syllabus of educational training of which we have been reminded to-day, but I will undertake to say that hon. Members, when they have heard my explanation, will agree that we have been wise in leaving these blank spaces. Everything that it was essential to decide we have decided; but in this matter we have felt it necessary to carry public opinion with us, or perhaps I should say instructed, educated and professional opinion with us—in all stages. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge said it was a very serious thing to allow these young officers to go to sea for three years without making proper provision for carrying on their instruction at sea, and I agree with him that this is a very important matter; but I do not think the right hon. Gentleman, if he were to peruse the reports of the results of education at sea, would be very anxious to see the present system prolonged, and the question is not whether we are abandoning anything of very great value, but whether we may not substitute something better. For the last six months we have been trying experiments in this respect with a training ship, H.M.S. "Isis." A decision on the questions as the carrying on of instruction in a training ship is awaiting the result of more extended experience of the trial now being made with such a ship. Another reason we have not been hasty in formulating some of these proposals with regard to some branches of this curriculum, is that we have been most anxious to submit the whole of the educational direction of this new scheme to a thoroughly competent person. We have felt that it is important that the head of the intellectual part of the Navy should be as competent and conspicuous a person as the head of the department responsible for material construction; and with that view we have approached, and happily approached, a very eminent and distinguished man, and have secured the services of Professor Ewing as Director of Naval Education as a successor to Dr. Niven on his retirement. Those who are acquainted with the scientific world and with the work Professor Ewing has been doing, with the position he holds in the Royal Society, and the position he occupies in the estimation of all men connected not merely with abstract science, but with applied science and mechanics in this country, will consider that we have been fortunate in obtaining the services of one whose work at the University of Cambridge, and whose high place in the esteem of all men for his scientific attainments, prove his knowledge to be, indeed, exceptional.

I do not think I need follow my hon. friend the Member for Devonport into the question of the Marines, because I venture to think it is not quite within the four corners of the Amendment. If I can answer any questions at a later stage I shall be glad to do so. I have devoted myself to the points which have been raised. The Admiralty, for the reasons I have endeavoured to explain, has elected for the earlier age. In regard to the question of nomination I think the Admiralty must be tried and tested by the work done. I think it is most important that they should have in mind what I know is in the mind of the hon. Member opposite, and that is the necessity of so exercising their powers that no members of the community who are reasonably likely to be serviceable in this great profession shall be prevented from entering it, but I am not prepared on behalf of the Admiralty, in view of the circumstances of the case or the experience of the past, to abandon the principle of nomination.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I have attended very closely to all that has been said on this most important subject, and I have heard nothing at all which shakes the two cardinal grounds on which I oppose the scheme of the Government in regard to the training of officers for the Navy. The first of these is the point which has been explained to the House by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, who, like myself, remembers all the debates and discussions which took place some years ago on this subject, when he was not the representative in this House of a learned body but of a dockyard constituency. I have an objection to taking these boys at so early an age as twelve and a half, making a separate class of them, and endeavouring to inspire them with what is called a sea-character. I have heard nothing to bring home to me the belief that the particular treatment to which they will be subjected by being kept in a college on shore will give them that sea-character; but whether it does so or not, going back to those debates to which I have referred, when we had present in this House several distinguished admirals, I remember that, while there was some difference of opinion among them, I think the predominant feeling was that no prejudice was likely to result to the Navy from future officers being entered at a much more advanced time of life than twelve or fifteen years of age. Putting the question of the early age of cadets aside, I come to another matter which is still more potent in determining my vote on this occasion, and that is the exclusiveness, which is necessarily characteristic, of this scheme. It is almost grotesquely ironical to think that there having been great complaints made—and I believe just complaints—of the treatment, by individuals in the Service, of engineer officers who are now important far beyond what they were some years ago—when there have been complaints that they, from social reasons undoubtedly, for I think it cannot be denied, they were subjected to a manner of treatment which was not likely to conduce to their comfort and therefore not likely to bring the proper sort of men into the service—you should adopt a scheme for getting over that difficulty by means of the extermination of that class of officer altogether, because hitherto engineers have been taken as a rule from the less wealthy and the less leisured classes in the community. It is not a question of the difference between the very rich and the working man, or the man who lives on a daily wage. The proportion of the population of this country with an income of over £1,000 a year is very small, and the whole of the different strata of society below some figure of that sort are practically excluded by this scheme. Now I think that is a most undesirable state of things, a state of things which would condemn any scheme you might propose.

My hon. friends on both sides of the House have talked of the evils of competition for boys, and, on the other hand, have declaimed against the system of nomination. I am certainly not in favour of nomination, and, above all, I hope we shall never come to the method referred to by the Secretary to the Admiralty, which he says prevails in the United States Navy. That would be the worst of all. It is not a question of nomination, or of open competition even; it is a question of expense, because a boy is taken at twelve and a half years of age for this long period of educative process for the Navy. We have no statement of estimate, that I am aware of, of what will be the expense of that. There will be, no doubt, heavy expense borne by the public, though part of it undoubtedly will fall upon the parents of the boys themselves; and although the hon. Gentleman has just said that the expense of the "Britannia" is not so severe at present, compared with the engineering college, as people might imagine, he is going to prolong the course by a period of four or five years, and the whole of that time the pocket of the parents of the boy has to furnish a large portion at all events of the expense. Therefore I regard that as practically prohibitive in respect of 80 or 90 per cent. of the population of the country. That is not a state of things to be contemplated for a moment. It is a systematic specialised education, but in this Paper it is all professed to be given in addition to the ordinary education. Do not let us be misled by the idea of public schools. The whole of the population are not in a position to send their children to great public schools. They get their education nearer home, and perhaps in a more efficient way, and certainly at less expense. I do not see any advantage whatever in the proposals that are made to compensate for the fact that, if this scheme is adopted, you will have stopped two sources of appointment, for officers, viz., the Marines and the Engineers, which are free from these impediments. You will practically have made it impossible for a large portion of the community to have a direct family interest in the upper ranks of His Majesty's Navy.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 200; Noes, 57. (Division List No. 34.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Bailey, James (*Walworth*)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (*Man'r*
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (*Hornsey*
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (*Leeds*
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benj.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alx. H. (*Shropsh.*)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt Hn J A (*Glasg.*)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V C W (*Derbysh.*)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (*Aston Manor*)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (*Greenwich*)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J A (*Worc*
Chamberlayne, T. (*Southmptn*
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Cox, Irwin Edwd. Bainbridge
Cranborne, Lord
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Jos. C.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Douglas, Charles M. (*Lanark*)
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, E. B. (*Hants, W.*)
Faber, George Denison (*York*)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Ed.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (*Leith*
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (*Man'r*
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (*St. Albans*
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Gordon, Maj Evans-(*Tr. Hmlts*
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E. W. (*Bury St. Ed.*
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (*Berwick*
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld. G. (*Midx*
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robt. Wm.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick G.
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, James (*Staffs., N. W.*)
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, RtHnH (*Somrst E*
Hope, J. F. (*Sheff., B'tside*)
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Joicey, Sir James
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (*Salop*
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (*Glasgow*
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Long, Col. Chas. W. (*Evesham*
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (*Cumb. Eskdale*)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (*Lowestoft*
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, RtHnSir H. E (*Wigt'n*
Maxwell, W. J. H. (*Dumfriessh.*
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Mitchell, William
Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
More, Robt. Jasper (*Shropshire*)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Moulton, John Fletcher
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, RtHn A. Graham (*Bute*
Murray, Col. Wyndham (*Bath*)
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (*Galway, N.*
O'Brien, Patrick (*Kilkenny*)
Palmer, Walter (*Salisbury*)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn. Wm. R. Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.

Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Rea, Russell
Reed, Sir Edw. Jas. (*Cardiff*)
Reid, James (*Greenock*)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hon. M. W (*Stalybridge*
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (*Sheffield*)
Robertson, H. (*Hackney*)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rothschild, Hon. L. Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Runciman, Walter
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Samuel, Herbt. L. (*Cleveland*)
Samuel, S. M. (*Whitechapel*)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Chas. Hilton (*Lincoln*)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, Jas. Parker (*Lanarks.*)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (*Somerset*)
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (*Oxf'd Univ*
Taylor, Austin (*East Toxteth*)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. E. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. CE(*Taunton*
Wharton, Rt. Hon. J. Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (*Ashton-u.-Lyne*)
Williams, Colonel R. (*Dorset*)
Wilson John (*Glasgow*)
Wilson, J. W. (*Worcestersh, N.*
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R(*Bath*
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robt. Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Chas. P. (*Glos., Stroud*)
Asher, Alexander
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter (*Lanark*
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (*Carmarthen*)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt Hon Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H
Holland, Sir William Henry
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, Wm. (*Carnarvonshire*)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (*Accrington*)
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, P. J. *Tipperary, N.*)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (*Dumfries*
Roberts, John H. (*Denbighs.*)
Robertson, Edmund (*Dundee*)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (*Forfarshire*)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Sir A. (*Glam., E.*)
Thomas, David A. (*Merthyr*)
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Wason, E. (*Clackmannan*)
Wason, J. Cathcart (*Orkney*)
Whitley, J. H. (*Halifax*)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, F.W. (*Norfolk, Mid*)
Wilson, H. J. (*York, W. R.*)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Gibson Bowles and Mr. Louth.

Main Question again proposed.

And it being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY (NAVY ESTIMATES).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [16th March], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Main Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): The Motion which I put upon the Paper, and which I should have been glad to move if there had been an opportunity of doing so, was couched in language used by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer in September last in an important speech which he made at Bristol. In the course of that speech Sir Michael Hicks-Beach said that, having regard to the expenditure during the last seven years on the Navy, he saw no need for the large expenditure for construction this year. That was advice given to the Government by a great authority, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, advice to which the Government might well defer, and the Estimates which we are considering to-night are the reply to that advice. Those Estimates are £34,500,000 against £31,000,000 last year. The Estimates this year are the largest that have ever been presented to the country. For years past we have been increasing the Navy, but never were there such rapid strides as during the last six years. Every year there has been an increase; in 1898 the increase was 1·8 millions, in 1899 2·5 millions, in 1900 2·2 millions, in 1901 2·1 millions. In 1902 there was practically no increase, but this year the increase is 3·2 millions, so that the reply of the Government to the advice given by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer is the largest increase they have ever made. This is another illustration of what I might almost call the defiant attitude of the Government with regard to the advice of its friends, and the feeling of the country. At the present moment the country is in need of a little rest and economy after the great efforts which it has been making, but the Government, instead of giving it that rest and economy, cast about to discover what heavy burden they could put upon it. The only standpoint from which I desire to look at this question is the standpoint of economy. I consider, looking at all the circumstances of the nation, that it is not fair on the part of the Government to ask the country to make this great sacrifice on their invitation.

On one or two things we are agreed. One is that we must have a strong Navy. I believe everybody both inside and outside this House is agreed upon that, but that agreement does not carry us very far. We may all agree that the Navy must be very strong when making speeches outside with regard to it, but when we come to this House and attack this problem it becomes a question of figures, and we must discuss how much we can afford to pay. It is my right hon. friend who represents the Forest of Dean who, amongst others, has urged on the Government to make a heavy expenditure for the Navy. My right hon. friend made a very interesting speech on this matter last week, when he said he would vote for this increase with the greatest possible pleasure, and would vote also for those larger Estimates to which he looked forward in the future. But there must be a point, Mr. Speaker, at which this miserable struggle will have to stop, and as we are the leaders in this matter—as we are the great spending Power—I say it is for us to try and discover some point at which this strife with other nations may be brought to an end. The hon. Gentleman who has charge of the Estimates said he looked forward to the time when somebody on the Continent would speak the word which would stop this vast expenditure. Who can speak that word so well as we? We have a most magnificent Navy and are the strong Power in this matter, but the Government has shown no disposition of that kind, and so this extraordinary situation has arisen.

Now on this situation I wish to make three remarks. First of all, the Government has departed entirely from the two-Power standard which has been the traditional policy of this country for many years. The meaning of that standard is that we should build as much as, and make as much naval preparation as, the two strongest Powers may, and if we make that much preparation that argument implies that there it should stop. There has never been a discussion in this House upon that question, and it is time, if that standard is to be departed from, that the question should be discussed and decided. We are departing entirely from the two-Power standard now. I try to look at this matter in the best way possible and with the best authorities I can get, and I find from the *Naval Annual* this year that we have 226 effective fighting ships, as compared with France with ninety-five, Germany with sixty-five, the United States of America with sixty-two, Russia with sixty-four, Italy with thirty-seven, and Japan with thirty-two. Those are the whole of the great naval Powers, and upon the strength of those ships the House will see that we have been maintaining the two-Power standard, and rather more, because if the House will add these figures together they will see that our Fleet is as large as the joint Fleets of any three Powers. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will say that we must have regard to what other nations are doing at the present moment, so I have taken pains to ascertain the total naval expenditure of the three great Powers, France, Russia, and Germany, as compared with our expenditure. Our Estimates last year for naval expenditure were £31,255,000, those of France £12,271,000, Russia £10,341,000, and Germany £10,454,000. So that, according to this test also, we are spending practically as much as these three great Powers against whom we are building. In new construction last year we spent 9·1 millions, France spent 4·4 millions, Russia 3·0 millions, and Germany 5·6 millions. So that again last year we were spending as much as any three Powers. In the face of these circumstances, what need is there for this greatly increasing expenditure? I think there is no reason. All these Powers are friendly Powers, and the disposition of the Government, and the House, and the country should be to retain and increase the friendly relations which exist between us. In France there has been a great change in the policy as regards this country. Monsieur Jaurès, the Socialist leader, at the recent elections became President of one of the high offices of the Chamber; the language of France towards us has been of the most peaceful character, and I certainly think that we should respond to this new friendly spirit. We ought to respect this friendly feeling; but when France holds out the olive branch to us, these arrangements we are making seem to me to be shaking our fist in her face in a very unneighbourly fashion. The hon. Member told us that the Mediterranean Squadron was being increased; but is not the Mediterranean a sea in which France must have profound interests? Then why should we not consult the wishes and feelings of our great and friendly neighbours, and not keep on adding in this unpleasant way. Looking at the state of France, I say there is no reason for this constant addition. It is impossible in this regard not to say a word with regard to Germany. In the King's Speech Germany was called our ally, and there are the deepest ties between Germany and this country. Then why not cultivate these friendly relations so far as the Navy is concerned? Some friends of mine attended a meeting held in Westminster some time ago, the object of which was to agitate for the strengthening of the North Sea Fleet. Such an agitation appeared to me to be merely raised to irritate a great and powerful ally. Now they tell us that although they have not got their squadron, they are perfectly satisfied because the Government are going to have a Naval Station on the North Sea. We are taking every step we can that may possibly irritate these Powers, and that is a most foolish thing for this country to do. We should cultivate friendly relations with them.

Now, with regard to Russia, I see no ground for that distrust of Russia. I have travelled over a great part of that country, and I find that she has a great land problem to occupy her for some time to come. I will say nothing about the United States, because I do not think any one will suggest that we are going to build up this immense fleet against anything the United States may do. I have quoted enough to justify me in saying that up to the present moment we maintain fully the strength of the Fleet according to the two-Power standard, and if we are prepared to face the Fleets which any of the two Powers can send against us, we are as safe now as we have been in the past. I would suggest that the Government, rather than spend this vast sum in building ships, might approach these countries and negotiate with a view to economy. Why, then, cannot we, who derive so much more advantage than France or Germany, do something to secure a peaceful solution of this great difficulty? In the speech of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, to which I have alluded, he deals with this point and gives advice, which, coming from his lips, comes with far higher authority than from any one else. He says—

> "The safety of the country depended on our policy with regard to other nations; we should carry out the Golden Rule of doing to others as we should wish them to do to us. Whilst keeping our powder dry, let us be careful to avoid provocation, whether by word or action, and let us estimate at their true value, which was nothing, the vapourings of the sensational Press, whether at home or abroad."

I commend those words to the Government as a solution of this great difficulty and avoiding this great expense. Large as these Estimates are they do not contemplate efficiency. They involve larger Estimates in the immediate future. If any one examines them they will find these Estimates open up a vista of extravagance such as this country never contemplated. Take Vote A. I am familiar, I am sorry to say, with the Estimates of the last forty years, and I find an established principle is laid down with regard to Vote A, which is that it shall be roughly one third of the whole of the Naval Estimates. In the year 1892 it was 34 per cent. of the whole, and in 1896 it was about 36 per cent., but this year it is no less than 51 per cent. £17,500,000 of the Estimates is devoted to this purpose of building new ships. Now we are going to construct a Naval base in Scotland, and when we have carried out that we cannot help seeing that that new expense opens up a vista of expense from which the country might well shrink before it is too late.

The hon. Member deals with another matter. He has given me the Return of casualties which I asked for, and in thanking him for that I would ask whether it is not possible to grant the other Returns I desired. We have only received the Return of casualties for 1901, and what do we find? We had at sea in 1901 200 ships, and the casualties amounted to 43 per cent.; we had twenty-six collisions, of which eleven were between our own vessels. That seems to me to prove that we have too many ships in these narrow seas, where they have not room to manœuvre, and where manœuvres cannot be carried out with success. In that year we lost 102 lives, and the total losses amounted to one second-class cruiser, a torpedo boat destroyer, two coast guard cruisers, and a vast amount was expended on repairs.

The last remark I wish to make in regard to the Estimates is, that they give no sense of security in the Navy. That is a point which the House might well consider. We have for ten years been urged by many hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House, as well as by hon. Gentlemen opposite, to pursue this furious and extravagant naval expenditure. The Estimates have gradually grown up during the past ten years from something like £14,500,000, which they stood at in 1893, to £34,000,000 this year, but does anybody feel that we are secure? Has the nation a more restful feeling with all this expenditure? On the contrary, the nation gets more and more distrustful as the expenditure goes on, and we have not reached any harbour of safety. Some people say that this naval expenditure is an insurance of our commerce. I have already pointed out that we had twenty years of experience of the Navy during which we made no increase. It was between 1863 and 1883 that our commerce increased from £13 per head of the population to £21; but in the last twenty years we have raised our naval expenditure from £12,000,000 to £34,000,000, and our commerce has only increased £1 per head. These remarkable statistics prove that this huge expenditure has not facilitated or given any security to commerce, but on the contrary, that it strikes a blow at and puts difficulties in the way of commerce.

*SIR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): It is now a good many years ago, at least six or seven, since I told the House that the naval expenditure would increase greatly every year. My reasons for doing so at that time were satisfactory to myself, although perhaps not obvious to my listeners. However, we are face to face with an expenditure of £34,000,000, and it will be my duty to-night to show how that expenditure is increased up to that amount. Before doing so, I would like to glance at the Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty concerning the Navy Estimates for 1903–4. One half of that Statement is hope, the other half despair! I will not deal with the administration of the Navy, or the *personnel*, but with the construction, reconstruction and repairs, which will in a few minutes lead me on to show why and how this extra amount of money is wanted this year. Perhaps at the risk of being considered a little irregular, I will take the points as they come up in the pages of the First Lord's Statement. I take first the clause where it is said—

> "Owing to the great pressure of work in the dockyards, it has been decided to allow the contractors who are building the ships to complete them in all respects ready for commission, by which means all the shipbuilding firms who construct war vessels will gain further experience, and be better prepared to undertake naval work."

And again, it is said that—

> "The policy of relieving the congestion of repairs in the dockyards by sending ships to be repaired by the private firms which built them, has been largely followed."

Now, here are two statements made by the First Lord of the Admiralty, and he has given no reason whatever as to what has occasioned this great pressure of work in the dockyards, or the congestion of repairs in the dockyards. Immediately before these clauses we get a statement of re-construction, as announced in the First Lord's Statement of last year. He says that the Admiralty has completed the re-construction of—

> "Battleships ('Royal Sovereign' Class)—'Empress of India,' 'Resolution,' 'Revenge,' 'Royal Oak.' First-class Cruiser—'Powerful.'

> Second-class Cruisers ('Talbot' Class)—'Doris,' 'Venus,' 'Dido,' 'Isis.' In hand (Battleships) —'Barfleur,' 'Centurion.' First-class Cruiser —'Terrible'."

Now I hold that this is a statement of the facts which are not put down here in such a way that any Member of the House can understand what they mean. Here is the first class cruiser "Powerful," a brand-new boat that cost the country £1,400,000, and now she is reconstructed. Then there is the first-class cruiser "Terrible," which cost the country the same amount of money, and she is being reconstructed, as are also the brand new battleships "Barfleur," and "Centurion." I have said that this statement is hardly correct; I do not want to use a stronger term. The First Lord says—

> "I have never attempted to minimise the difficulties which have been caused to the Fleet by the adoption of Belleville boilers; these difficulties were due partly to the faulty manufacture of the first series of such boilers, partly to the great increase of pressure, and partly to the initial want of training of the *personnel* in their management."

I deny that. These boilers were built under Government inspection by Admiralty inspectors who were paid big salaries. I say that they were good jobs, and were considered good jobs, and lauded in the papers, which sang of these mighty cruisers and what they were going to do. Here again is a statement which I say is not correct—

> "As each of the earlier Belleville boiler ships comes in for refit on the termination of her commission she is being placed in thorough repair and made absolutely efficient for service."

I deny that. They are not absolutely efficient for service. There is not one of them which has been repaired that can steam what she could steam when new. Then the statement goes on—

> "Owing to the experience gained no further difficulties ought to occur with these ships."

Indeed, no further difficulties! The "Russell," the "Canopus," the "Glory," "Ocean" and others could not do their work, and, forsooth, it is written in this paper that "No further difficulties ought to occur with these ships."

Then the statement goes on—

> "Although the Board agree with the Boiler Committee in considering other types of water-tube boilers to be much preferable, they also share the Committee's view that to replace these boilers by others in the ships which already have them would be an unjustifiable, because an unnecessary, expense."

I deny that phrase; I say that a seeming prodigality in that case would be economy in the end. You cannot keep down your Estimates every year by having such repairs arising out of this factor alone. We are told it would be unjustifiable. Is it unjustifiable to make an efficient warship? What is a warship for if not efficient? The cry of efficiency has risen like a storm from the Admiralty, and yet the First Lord comes here and hands us a Statement that it would be unjustifiable to make these ships fit to fight! I think such a Statement is unworthy of the Board of Admiralty, and ought not to have been issued to the House of Commons. Again the First Lord says—

> "I warned Parliament that the cost of repairs for the boilers of the earlier ships fitted with the water-tube boilers would prove to be very heavy."

Oh yes! it was very easy to warn Parliament when the ships were broken down by the dozen; but the First Lord should have taken the warning given ten years ago, and he would have had less Estimates to-day. How amusing it is to me to see the phraseology of this statement—

> "At the same time I pointed out that the history of the experience of the use of any new invention generally proceeded on similar lines."

Why, whoever advised the First Lord to use such phraseology did not know his business! The water-tube boiler is not a new invention; it never was an invention; it is a contrivance. It has been before the engineering world for over a hundred years, and, forsooth, to call it an invention is playing with words. I have known the water-tube system for fifty years, and call it nothing but a contrivance. Then the First Lord says—

> "In my opinion, the water-tube boiler has come to stay."

Well, if that is his view, it is probable that it has come to ruin his Fleet, and increase his Naval Estimates year by year. "The water-tube boiler has come to stay!" Why, the new Admiralty Yacht, the "Enchantress," now building at Belfast, is to be fitted with Scotch boilers! Are the Lords of the Admiralty afraid to trust themselves with water-tube boilers? If water-tube boilers are good enough for men-of-war, surely they are good enough for the Admiralty yacht.

> "For ways that are dark, and for tricks that
> are vain,
> The Admiralty Lords are peculiar."

Now I come to another phase of this wonderful production, and my comments thereon will tend to cast light on the great amount of money required for what I call Admiralty follies. The First Lord says—

> "The trials of the 'London,' 'Venerable,' and 'Russell,' as well as those of the 'Duncan' and 'Exmouth,' were carried out with successful results. The speeds obtained on trial were slightly in excess of the estimated speeds as designed."

I deny that; they were not carried out to a successful result. The "Russell" tried to do it three or four times but could not. Then again it is said—

> "That the 'Montagu's' trials are not yet complete."

This Grand new ship, which cost £1,250,000, came round from Birkenhead to do a trial, and ought to have been able to get up steam and go outside fit to fight an enemy. But what happened? The boilers could not hold water! I see she is crawling outside just now, after lying in port for six or eight months.

I come now to the heading "Submarines," where it is said that—

> "At the commencement of the year there were five vessels of the 'Holland' type under construction, and they have all been delivered."

And they are going to lay down nine or ten others. On February last I said in this House: Why could not this great and glorious Admiralty of ours give any encouragement to British engineers in designing sub-marine boats? They had sent instead over to America, bought their drawings, and put the construction of these sub-marines into the hands of Maxim, Vickers & Company, under the superintendence of a Yankee. And with what result? They could not trust them, because they did not know the moment they were going to have an explosion. There had been explosions, and the men blown through the manhole, while the crew were nearly asphyxiated by the gasoline. Yet the Admiralty are going blindly ordering more submarine boats when they have had no experience of those already built. I would ask those at the Admiralty responsible for this to go down in a submarine boat under the water, and not sit complacently in the Admiralty Office. They would then get some knowledge of submarine requirements. Apart from patriotic principles, I am sure that if the Admiralty go on ordering more foreign boats of which they have had no experience they are bound to come to grief with great loss of life. Now, as to the re-boilered ships. The "Hermes" came to grief before she got to the West Indies. The boilers burned out, and her men were in danger of their lives, and almost in a state of mutiny. She was sent to Belfast for repair, and is now being fitted with Babcock and Wilcox boilers. I ask, partly with regret, and partly with sorrow, what experience has the Admiralty got of the Babcock and Wilcox boilers? None whatever. This is another American contrivance, not British, and that is how the money goes. There is no mystery about the increase of expenditure when we find in the "List of repairs" no fewer than seventeen boats not yet three years old. I do not believe a single one of them has done a twelve months steaming.

What are we coming to? I may be wrong, but I see before me an array of broken-down vessels that cannot be trusted to steam full power without coming to grief, and which would in an engagement be assuredly sunk because they could not be manœuvred by the admirals or captains either full speed or slow. What is the reason? I will show the Secretary to the Amiralty what is the reason why you cannot steam your ships at full speed. The reason is in a nutshell. You cannot synchronise your feeding, firing and steaming. You never will get them to synchronise with water-tube boilers, because you have too little margin of safety. The scientific aspect of the question therefore hangs on three points, namely, feeding, firing, and steaming, and these must all synchronise or they are bound to come to grief. I wish to direct the attention of the House just for a moment to this peculiar fact. A Return was asked for by Lord Charles Beresford of casualties in regard to marine boilers extending over five years in the mercantile marine. I have here a copy of the Return, and I would like to give some of the figures. The total number of Scotch boilers in use throughout Great Britain is given at 22,000, while the total number of water-tube boilers is placed at 58. Of the 58, 11 gave out and failed, and that reduces the number to 47, and yet in the face of that practical fact the Admiralty are retaining Babcock and Wilcox boilers for ships costing £1,500,000. Whoever heard of such blindness? The numbers of persons killed and injured per thousand in the ships using Scotch boilers is 4·32 casualties, 1·36 persons killed, and 1·5 injured. In boilers of the water-tube modern type the figures are 120·6 casualties per 1,000, 86·2 killed, and 103·4 injured. On the face of that Return, issued by a Government Department, you are still putting into your valuable vessels boilers which at the present time are endangering hundreds of lives.

Again, how do these boilers compare with regard to cost? I am going to show how you are mounting up your millions every year. With the old type of Scotch boiler vessels of the "Majestic" class, after five years and five months of working, cost £2,319, but vessels of the "Diadem" class, which is the new modern ship costing £1,000,000, and is only two years old, cost £9,048. Take the "Powerful" class, which after three years and seven months of water tube-boilers cost £16,184, and compare it with a similar class fitted with Scotch boilers, which for a similar period cost only £1,823. What does that tell this House and the country. There is a voice in these figures that ought to re-echo throughout the country. In two years and three months there was £194,000 spent on twenty-nine ships fitted with water-tube boilers, or an average of £6,700 per ship. With Scotch boilers over fifty ships in four years and eight months cost £101,420, or about £2,000 per ship, showing that your water-tube boiler ship is running up your bill very heavily. I must complain bitterly of the way these Estimates are got up, for the items are not put down on business lines. Every ship ought to have attached in the Estimates the original cost and the cost of repairs every year. Under Sub-head D I find reconstruction, repairs and alterations for 1903–4 represents £3,156,008. Last year it was £2,195,528. That shows you have a repairing increase of £1,065,663. But that is not all we have paid for, there is still the material and other things which are not shown in these Estimates in a businesslike way.

We are now brought face to face with this fact, that we have from sixty to eighty vessels fitted with water-tube boilers, every one of which you cannot trust. What is the Admiralty doing? When vessels require new boilers they are still putting in water-tube boilers. Are you going to have your warships useless, and what can your ships depend upon if they cannot steam properly? I would have stood up here and defended the clearing out of the whole of these water-tube boilers and the putting in of the same boilers in all your ships as you have put into the "Enchantress." Instead of putting in a mixture of water-tube and cylindrical boilers in your ships, I would have put in all cylindrical boilers, and made the ships safe for the men. Water-tube boilers burn twice the quantity of coal, and you require more men. You require more artificers, and consequently not only is the cost increased but also the pay. But these figures will rise even more than that, because as these boats are tested they are bound to go into the hospital for repairs, and you will never really get to the bottom of the expense. I am sorry that I have spoken so long, but this is a matter in which I have always taken great interest. No one would be more ready to defend the Admiralty when they are pursuing a sane and safe course than I should be. No one would be more ready to defend the Admiralty if they were getting one pound's worth for every pound spent. But when I see the ships absolutely being turned to no ships at all, that is no fighting ships, would I be doing my duty if I did not speak my mind and express my convictions in this House? Take as an example the case of your "Good Hope," the vessel that was to indicate 30,000 horse-power, and steam twenty-three knots. She has recently been to the Cape, but I would like to know if she can steam twenty-three knots to-day. She cannot do it, for she would be sure to come to grief, and she would be lying a cripple before long. She is almost one now. The Admiralty are not spending the nation's money upon ships, but upon repairs; and, although millons of money have been spent in this way, the vessels have done no real genuine ocean steaming work, and so far as their fighting qualities go they are a disgrace to the Admiralty.

*MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): I am sorry that I must now ask the House to postpone for a short time the naval discussion. My excuse for raising another question is threefold. In the first place, the question I have to raise is a grievance which is felt very keenly by seamen in the Navy. It is one which is felt by hundreds, almost thousands, of old seamen, and by all those who sympathise with the men of the lower deck. In the second place, this question has not been raised here since 1898; and in the third place, if I do not take this opportunity of saying a few words on the subject, it is very doubtful whether I shall have another chance, because the Votes for purely naval matters are sure to come first. I desire as briefly as possible to explain the circumstances connected with the history of Greenwich Hospital. I shall avoid figures as much as possible, and I will try and arrive at my conclusions by general statements. Hon. Members familiar with the history of Greenwich Hospital will be aware that in the year 1694 William and Mary gave Greenwich Palace as a hospital for the relief of seamen and their widows and children. There had been a fund, known as the Chatham Chest, instituted in the reign of Elizabeth for granting pensions to disabled seamen. This was amalgamated with the Greenwich Hospital funds in the year 1814. These funds had been variously estimated at a sum between £7,000,000 and £70,000,000, but when the chest was opened, like the Humbert safe, it was found to be practically empty. All that is known with regard to this fund is that the sailors for whose benefit it was intended never got the money. In the year 1834 the contribution of 6d. per month by all seamen was stopped, and a grant in lieu thereof of £20,000 per annum was made by Parliament to the Greenwich Hospital fund.

In 1865 a Bill was introduced disestablishing the hospital as an asylum and substituting out-pensions for old seamen at 5d. per day at fifty-five years of age, and 9d. per day at seventy years of age. In the year 1869 the hospital was finally closed. In the year 1875 the seventy years age limit was reduced to sixty-five, and in the year 1878 the pensions were limited to 7,500 in number for the first time. Before 1878 every man got his pension at fifty-five as a matter of course, but since then only so many get pensions as the funds available permit. All those who have joined since the year 1878 know what their position is, but I do not think this decision ought to affect those who joined or re-engaged in the Navy before 1878. In 1885 the Committee known as the Duke of Edinburgh's Committee was appointed. In the year 1892 a Select Committee of this House was appointed, and three things happened. In the first place, in 1869, when the hospital was closed, the Government paid £100 per annum as rent for the building. This Committee recommended that instead of £100 they should pay £5,000, and in the year 1897 this was augmented to £6,500. Consequently these funds have been poorer all these years by the difference between £100 and £6,500. In the second place, I have shown that in 1834 Parliament made a grant of £20,000 a year to this hospital, and in 1869 they made the hospital funds pay the Government £16,000 a year. The Committee to which I have referred which sat in 1892 restored the full £20,000 to the hospital, so that for all these years the hospital has been out of pocket to the extent of £16,000 a year. In the third place, the limit of 7,500 pensions was abolished. Until 1890 the funds had been charged with what was known as the Seamen Pensioners' Reserve. It was admitted that this ought to be a public charge, and consequently the funds were relieved, and this charge was put upon the Imperial funds. The argument I am basing my case upon is that if the funds had not been drained all these years by the money which had been taken away in the manner I have indicated there would have been so much more money to go round now. The injustice of this draining has been admitted by subsequent action, but no compensation has been paid for the large sums of money which have been taken away from the hospital. A former Member for Woolwich, Colonel Hughes, computed the arrears of compensation due to the hospital at £851,000. I do not give any particular figures, for all I am anxious to do is to endeavour to establish a principle.

In the next place, if a soldier or sailor is killed in action, his widow gets a pension from the Government. If a sailor is killed on duty and not in action, his widow gets a pension and a smaller one not from the Government but from Greenwich Hospital. This was illustrated the other day by the instance of the "Cobra" and the "Viper." The point I submit is that where men lose their lives in operations not entirely distinct from operations of war the money given to the widows should not be a charge to the institution but on the Imperial fund. In 1898 the Postmaster-General denied there was any right. It is quite true that one cannot produce any official document which would validate and establish this claim in a court of law, but it is also true that a recruiting bill was once issued. It was withdrawn and cannot be produced. In 1865 Mr. Childers brought in a Bill, and he then said pensions would be given to all out-pensioners. In 1875, when the age of seventy was reduced to sixty-five, Mr. Ward Hunt, explaining some rearrangements, said—

> "This would give the pensioners a claim to pension at sixty-five instead of seventy."

I have a letter from an old chief petty officer, who says his memory is sufficiently good to remember the exact wording of the clauses in the Circular issued by the Admiralty to the Fleet in 1865. It ran thus—

> "Clause 3, Section 2. If he is fifty-five years of age, and has been a pensioner for five years (whether in the hospital or out), he will be paid 5d. per day, that is, £7 12s. 0d. per annum. If he is seventy years of age, and has been a pensioner ten years (whether in the hospital or out,) he shall receive 9d. per day, that is £13 12s. 0d. per annum."

Then in the Committee of 1892 the Report contains the words—

> "Your Committee are of opinion that the men who joined the Navy before 1878 have a strong claim to special consideration."

My right hon friend the Member for Wigtonshire observed to Lord Welby—

> "I understand you to say, that if the justice of this claim were established you would recognise the obligation of the public to bear the charge of these Greenwich age pensions."

Lord Welby replied—

> "Certainly, I anticipate that if the justice of the cause was established, Parliament would wish what it thought justice to be satisfied."

I referred a little while ago to the Duke of Edinburgh's Committee. In answer to a question as to the inducements of this pension, Sir Richard Awdry replied—

> "I have no doubt that in recruiting, the most rosy view of the circumstances is put before the man in order to induce him to recruit."

The same gentleman in 1892 admitted that there was nothing to prevent the recruit from believing that the pension would come to him at fifty-five. As a matter of fact, every man who joined or re-engaged before 1878 did so in this implicit belief. As for the use to which these funds were put, there is a debateable point as to whether officers pensions should be chargeable to the fund. Mr. Childers admitted this was a disputed point, but it was not one put in the forefront, and I do not press it. A most important observation appearing in the Duke of Edinburgh's Memorandum is this—

> "To my mind the age pension is the most legitimate mode of applying the funds of Greenwich Hospital."

In the last Report issued, the capital expenditure of the Hospital was put at £198,400, and among the items were £7,000 pensions to officers, £5,500 pensions to widows of marines or seamen drowned at sea, £500 as gratuities to widows and relatives of seamen or marines drowned at sea, and £100,000 as age pensions to seamen or marines. So that for those whom the Duke of Edinburgh said had the best claim to the funds of this Hospital, only about one-half of these funds were allocated to the purpose. The only system by which it can be administered at present is that of selection, and no better system can be found. The Admiralty with perfect propriety and justice choose the men best entitled to have the first claim on these pensions. That, however, is obviously unsatisfactory at times. For example, I know a pensioner well over sixty who has not received a pension. He is a man of industry and energy, and is a bandmaster in a Volunteer corps. He pointed out that his energy and industry have enabled him to make a provision against old age, whilst some of his old shipmates who had not taken such pains to provide for themselves had received the pensions in priority to him, although they were younger men. The point is, that there ought to be more money available. As time goes on, with the inevitable increase of the Navy, there will be more widows to provide for, and on the other hand there will be fewer seamen of ante-1878. Meanwhile, I submit that we ought to make some provision for these old seamen whose claims, even if they cannot be established by law, have a very strong recommendation on grounds of equity. Lord Welby said—

> "If Parliament recognises the justice of the claim they will not refuse to grant the money."

That justice I am trying to establish, and I do most earnestly urge the Admiralty to settle the question and remove a grievance which soft words will do very little to remedy.

As to the more general questions arising out of the speeches to which we have listened, I feel that anybody who endeavours to study naval problems and interests must see that the subject is obviously surrounded by the mists of uncertainty. We can never tell what it is we may have to contend with some day. There are some matters connected with the Navy which we shall never solve except by experience—and experience is the very last thing we desire. No one can tell us the effect of lyddite shells on armoured ships. The best judges cannot agree on the probable effect of shells on protected ships, the superiority of big battle ships and heavy guns over a swarm of destroyers and torpedo boats, or the right proportion of cruisers. It is not like a game where the qualities of the two sides are pretty well known, but the whole prospect is enshrouded in gloom which can only be lifted by the light of experience, and that is exactly what we want to avoid. Moreover, there are additional discoveries which revolutionise the circumstances and requirements of all nations, and for which the Government cannot be held more responsible than for the change of weather. But there are certain things about which there need be no uncertainty. We cannot see whether or not we are working on the right lines, building the right ships, and getting the right guns, but it is easy to determine whether those we have are perfect and whether we have an adequate supply of men in the service to work them.

Another point is often ignored. I do not admire very much the word efficiency. People who have no definite principles to advocate often use the word "efficiency" with a comfortable feeling that if they say it often enough things will turn out all right somehow. I think efficiency as a principle is inadequate, but in its special application it is very pertinent indeed, and therefore I rejoice that in the Memorandum of the First Lord the importance of efficiency in gunnery is dwelt upon. That is the more gratifying because there is much room for improvement. I have here figures giving the result of recent prize firing in the Navy. They show the need for improvement, and it is satisfactory to know that the weak spot in our artillery has been realised. I find that with twelve guns the following results were obtained, viz.—

"Illustrious"	with	18 shots	hit	6	times
"Jupiter"	,,	22 ,,	,,	5	,,
"Albion"	,,	11 ,,	,,	4	,,
"Hannibal"	,,	29 ,,	,,	3	,,

or out of a total of 80 shots there were only 18 hits, whilst the "Ocean" obtained 17 hits out of 25 shots. Then, in the case of six guns I find that the—

"Illustrious"	with	83 shots	hit	40	times
"Aboukir"	,,	103 ,,	,,	28	,,
"Prince George"	,,	100 ,,	,,	40	,,

making a total of 108 hits out of 286 shots, whilst the "Ocean" hit 108 times out of a total of 163 shots. My point is that if one ship can do so well there is no excuse for the other ships doing so badly, and we can at all events demand the same satisfactory result. I should like to ask incidentally whether all the ships in these fleets have been provided with telescopic sights. Then there is another point on which we need have no uncertainty at all. (The hon. Member read an extract from page 12 of the Report of the Manœuvres of the Combined Fleets, 1902, showing that certain vessels broke down when the attempt to keep up a high speed was made). This is my point. A speed of fifteen knots was maintained for four hours, but the "Repulse" had difficulty in keeping this up, and the Commodore reduced to thirteen. We may reasonably require that our ships shall not break down in that manner. There should be a reasonable probability of a gun hitting the target aimed at, and of a ship arriving at its destination punctually without breaking down on the way. Another matter is the difficulty of distinguishing between friends and enemies. Hon. Members will be aware that the ships of the Navy have recently been painted a certain colour which is not pleasant to look at, although that does not matter if it makes them difficult to see, but I do not know that that helps us to distinguish our friends from our enemies, because if all the ships were painted the same colour I believe it would be quite impossible to distinguish between certain of our own ships and those of the German "Kaiser" class, the Russian battleship, "Borodino" or the French "Jena." I hope our Intelligence Department is considering whether anything can be done to assist our sailors in time of war to distinguish our enemy's from our own ships.

On the matter of general policy, as to what this country is going to do in the way of augmenting our Navy, I greatly deprecate the inclination or desire of amateur associations to dictate our policy. I say this without any disrespect to my hon. friend the Member for Chester, but I believe such a course of action to be wrong in principle and dangerous in its tendency. Such associations are responsible to nobody; they cannot possibly be well-informed in the sense in which the Government is informed, and they may be carried away by the fads of a section, or even an individual among their Members. Their object is a good one —that of making the country wake up —but there are many ways of waking up, and the methods of these associations suggest rather a child waking up in the dark and screaming with fright, with the result that there is a danger of panic and scare legislation. A recent meeting at Westminster Palace Hotel was noteworthy for several reasons. It was prefaced by a curious exordium in the form of a letter written, not by a naval officer or a recognised authority on naval matters, but by a very distinguished author whose only connection with the Navy is that he once wrote an admirable novel, the hero of which was a sailor. I wish to point out that these amateur associations are very apt to be carried away. In 1899 there was a marked tendency to force our Government into armed conflict with Russia over China. In 1901 we were told that the French had given up their defensive policy and embarked on an offensive policy and were about to attack us in the Mediterranean. But what happened? So far from attacking us they reduced their fleet in the Mediterranean. We are now told that we are in imminent peril of assault from Germany. All over the world we must be prepared for German competition and rivalry, but I should like to point out that this accession of German naval strength is no new thing. As far back as 1848, when the Danes blockaded German ports, it was found that German commercial and maritime interests suffered so much that for the first time there was a demand for a fleet. This was afterwards accentuated, and in 1868 Bismarck took up the question, and we had his first naval programme. This feeling is still growing in Germany. Their interests are growing; their ambitions and aspirations are growing; and, accordingly, their Navy is growing. I maintain that it is a mistake for an association suddenly to declare that you are in danger of attack from Germany, because Germany is carrying out a policy which seems to me to be an obvious policy, one which we could not prevent if we desired to do so, and one which in the natural course of events they were bound to adopt. Greater sobriety of expression would be more suitable to the case and more appropriate to our self-respect.

It has been said that there is a tendency in Germany and France to curtail expenture in this direction. I am encouraged to hope that a reaction has set in, and that both in Germany and in France there is a growing disinclination for the terrible burdens imposed by such expenditure, and that we may hope by-and-bye to see a slowing down in the process. If that be so our burden will be proportionately lighter.

But whether it be so or not, I maintain that on no account must we fall below the standard we have set before us. That standard may be too low, but it certainly is not too high. Of course we may wish for many reasons that we could rely on a more substantial contribution from our Colonies, but manifestly we cannot press that point very strongly. Moreover, if the Colonies do not choose to help us more, the fact remains that for our own sake, as well as for theirs, we must keep the Navy up to its present state of efficiency. Although the Colonies share the advantages of their connection with the Empire, we need make no sentimental mistake; we have to provide for the security of the Empire, and the charge will remain with us. I apologise for trespassing so long on the time of the House, as there are many other Members desiring to speak; it is most desirable that they should do so, because it is here and not at the Westminster Palace Hotel that the true responsibility rests.

* MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): Three years ago I raised the question of the Greenwich old age pensions, and I must briefly recapitulate the claim which these pensioners make. When Greenwich Hospital was closed to pensioners in 1865, an undertaking was given that pensioners at fifty-five years of age should receive an augmentation of 5d. per day. There was no mention of any limit until 1878, when the number was fixed at 7,500. Therefore the men argue, and I agree with them, that all who joined prior to 1878 are fully entitled to receive the augmentation on reaching the age of fifty-five. The sole justification alleged for the action of the Admiralty, so far as I have been able to follow their contention, is that the funds are inadequate to enable them to give pensions to all these men. In this connection I would put two points to the House; first, that there is an actual breach of contract with the men, and, secondly, that funds which really belong to the men have been unjustly diverted. The undertaking given in 1865 was a contract. Recruiting bills have been issued since then repeating the promise that on reaching the age of fifty-five the men would become entitled to the augmentation of 5d. per day. Reference has already been made to the evidence of Admiralty officers, and one of them stated—

> "Although you cannot look upon these recruiting placards as legal contracts, enforceable in a court of law, they are moral contracts."

When we discussed this matter in 1898, I was challenged to produce one of these recruiting bills. In 1900, the question having aroused some interest in the country, a bill was produced. A recruiting officer wrote to a Member of this House saying he had a bill which he himself had issued, and I have that bill here. This bill was issued at Bristol, and these words appear upon it—

> "After completing his term, or attaining the age of fifty-five years, he receives in addition to his pension fivepence per day."

This bill was issued under the auspices of Her late Majesty, and is no doubt an authentic document. The ingenious gentleman, if I may use the phrase without offence, the present Postmaster-General, who preceded the present Civil Lord, produced a bill on which that clause was omitted, and made the extraordinary justification for not admitting the validity of this bill that he did not see why he should be bound more by one bill than by the other. Referring to this particular bill, the Postmaster-General said—

> "It was printed on the order of the marine recruiting officer at Bristol, without any instructions from the Admiralty, and without the Admiralty having seen it. It was the regrettable practice in those days for the recruiting officers to be allowed to publish their own literature without submitting it to the Admiralty."

Surely the Government ought not to be allowed to ride off on any such plea as that. These recruiting officers are men in their own service, and the Government are responsible for the doings of their servants. These men do not ask for this money in a begging way. These particular Greenwich funds were built up out of the compulsory levy not only on seamen of the Royal Navy, but on all seamen in the British Marine; indeed, the levy applied to all seamen in the Colonies, including the Colonies of America, now the United States. That compulsory levy ceased only in 1834, and the men claim that Greenwich Hospital and its belongings are really their own property. There have been serious diversions of these funds, and I mention this to meet the point of the Admiralty that they have an inadequacy of funds to satisfy this demand. In 1878, the seamen pensioners reserve was formed, and, as an inducement to join, the men were promised the augmentation at the age of fifty instead of fifty-five. Instead of charging the cost of thus hastening the augmentation on the Navy Vote, it was made a charge on the Greenwich funds. The service was a national service, and the charge was protested against at the time, but it was continued until 1893, when the Government of the day saw the justice of the complaint, and the charge was put on the ordinary Votes. £50,000 was thus taken away, and no restitution has been made.

After the closing of Greenwich Hospital the building was taken over by the Admiralty, mainly for their own purposes, and they paid the monstrously inadequate rent of £100 a year, although it was rated at £8,500. This continued from 1865 to 1893, when again justice was done, and a rental of £6,000 a year was paid by the Government. The difference in the rental for the twenty eight years amounted to £170,000, and again no restitution has been made. Then there is the arrangement made in 1834, when the compulsory levy ceased, that the Consolidated Fund should give £20,000 a year to Greenwich. Some years afterwards the Chancellor of the Exchequer appropriated £16,000 of that money, and succeeding Chancellors of the Exchequer continued to do so, until 1893, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth, who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer, saw the justice of the case and restored the £16,000 for the benefit of Greenwich. The loss Greenwich had suffered meanwhile amounted to £400,000, and again no restitution has been made, so that on those three items there has been illegally diverted from Greenwich funds £620,000. If this money had not been so diverted there would have been plenty of money to pay the augmentation, at all events to the men who joined prior to 1878. My hon. friend has mentioned many cases of charges being made, even to-day, on Greenwich funds which ought to be borne by the State. The men feel that they have a great grievance, and the reputation of the nation is at stake. So long as the Admiralty continue in the attitude they have taken up it will be a bad thing for the Navy. These old pensioners are scattered all over the country, and their constant complaint is that they have been denied that to which they have a legal right, and I hope the hon. Gentleman will hold out some expectation of there being meted out to these men the justice which their case deserves.

*MR. PRETYMAN (Suffolk, Woodbridge): The question of the Greenwich Hospital funds has been so often debated that I do not think I can add a great deal to what has been said before. The whole matter really turns on the point of equity and is, whether these pensioners are only eligible for or actually entitled to these pensions. The hon. Member for Devonport asserted that there had been a breach of the contract made in 1865, and that the funds which are clearly the funds of the Hospital had been diverted. Everyone is aware that the matter was most carefully investigated by the Committee of 1892, and that the Committee made a very clear statement with regard to it. They said they were unable to recognise that this misapprehension—and I may say here that the misapprehension was a very natural one—established the right to claim a pension, but they thought there was a claim to special consideration. Now really the whole point of the defence which has to be made to this matter is that these men really have no right to claim the pension. I desire to correct the hon. Member for Devonport on another point. He said that prior to 1878 no limitation of pensions was ever proposed. Now the original Committee, by which the plan for the re-organisation of the funds of Greenwich Hospital was carried out in 1865, said—

> "It will be equally necessary to limit the number of extra pensions to be granted so as to afford a fair margin. We think provision should be made for 5,000 extra pensions."

It was clearly intended, therefore, that there should be a limitation, and that was enforced by a Minute of the Board of Admiralty, although it was not promulgated in the form of a published order. That limitation was on the original recommendation of the Committee on whose report the re-organisation was based. Any charge of breach of faith that can be laid against this Government or successive Governments is solely based on the fact of insufficient promulgation, and that is not a very strong ground to go upon. Then as to the defence made by the Postmaster-General the hon. Member alleges that it was that some particular paragraph was not included in the Recruiting Bill. I can find no such defence. The defence he made was not based on the existence or omission of any particular paragraph, but in a bill that was issued by one particular recruiting officer in one particular locality. The words of the defence were these—

> "The bill can only apply to Marines in the Bristol district who entered between October, 1887, and the completion of the circular in 1878."

Therefore the only persons who could have been deceived by that bill—and it was issued by a recruiting officer without authority—were those in a limited area who in 1887-78 entered as Marines.

*MR. KEARLEY: The bill went all through the country.

*MR. PRETYMAN: The only bill that has ever been traced or referred to in this House is that particular printed bill. If the hon. Member can produce evidence that there was any other bill than this——

*MR. KEARLEY: No, of course I cannot. I cannot produce recruiting bills from all over the country. You challenged me to produce one, and I have produced it.

*MR. PRETYMAN: I do not wish to put the case unfairly, nor do I think my hon. friend wishes to exaggerate it. Having narrowed the area down to the point of expectation created by the bill, I have shown, I think, the measure of breach of faith that can be charged. Next, with regard to the question of the funds having been diverted, there was a most careful investigation by the Committee of 1892. That Committee suggested that certain increases should be made to the Greenwich funds in order to cover the growth in the pension list, and that moneys should be granted by Parliament. They were so granted, but owing to the steady and continuous increase in the Navy there are not nearly sufficient pensions to allow one to be granted in all cases, and approximately sixty years is the age to be reached before a pension can be obtained. My hon. friend quoted the case of a bandmaster who had not been given a pension, although he was older than some of his fellows who were in receipt of one. It is not a question whether a man is entitled to a pension, but rather of whether men who are not entitled and are only eligible for it are actually in want. That fact has to be considered in dealing with these pensions. The Admiralty has taken every possible means within its power to increase and develop the funds of the Greenwich Hospital charity; it now amounts to £200,000 a year, and that has enabled the number of pensions to be largely increased. Instead of a 5,000 limit, there are now over 10,000, which result has been obtained by a judicious investment and by improvement of the various properties held by the fund. If the State at any time take a burden off the charity and provide by means of State funds for the widows and children of soldiers and sailors who may lose their lives, that would be a sensible relief; it would benefit the fund to the extent of £5,500 a year, and would enable the number of pensioners to be increased. All the Admiralty can do is to distribute the pensions in the fairest way and make them go as far as they possibly can. The Admiralty share the desire of my hon. friend to see that every seaman shall have a pension on attaining the age of fifty-five years. We have already heard a protest against the size of the Naval Estimates, and it is quite evident that those Estimates would have to be largely increased if the pension list is enlarged, as it would open up a rather large question of pensions in all irections. All that we can say is, if the House grants more money we will do our best to apply it in the most beneficial manner.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.): I have always felt that Scotland had two grievances in connection with the Navy Estimates. In the first place, while Scotland pays 11 per cent. of the Imperial expenditure, only an infinitesimal part of that expenditure is spent in Scotland. The Fleet is moored in English waters, whilst the great Government dockyards are in the South of England, notwithstanding that Scotland has excellent harbour accommodation both on the East and West Coasts, and that the Clyde, with its shipbuilding industry, with its supply of workmen, and with its proximity to coal and iron, is pre-eminently suitable for a Government dockyard. No doubt the Government have given large orders for warships to be built on the Clyde, but whilst such contracts are an undoubted present benefit to the Clyde, I doubt very much whether they will prove to be an ultimate advantage. It is to be hoped, for the sake of the taxpayers, that warship-building will not increase in the future as it has done in the past, but with a cessation or decline in war-ship building considerable trade depression may ultimately set in which may seriously, and for a considerable time prejudicially, affect the Clyde.

The second grievance Scotland has is that whilst both on the East and West coasts there are large shipping ports and interests, up to the present there has been no naval base in Scotland, no rendezvous for the Fleet, no setting apart of special war vessels to take up their positions in defence of certain specified ports and harbours with the intricacies of which they have made themselves specially acquainted, and no arrangement for convoys, so that the traffic to and from the ports may not be interrupted in the event of war suddenly breaking out with a first-class sea power. The new naval base at St. Margarets' Hope, in the Firth of Forth, will undoubtedly to a large extent mitigate, if not entirely remove, both of these grievances so far as the East coast of Scotland is concerned. It will provide a Government dockyard in proximity to the coal and iron industries of Scotland, whilst it will provide an excellent harbour for a fleet of any size watching and protecting the harbours and ports on the East coast of Scotland. It will enable ships of war operating on that coast to be repaired and refitted and to be replenished with ammunition without requiring them to proceed to the South of England for that purpose; but under existing circumstances this will not help the harbours or shipping industries on the West coast in the event of war. The whole complexion of matters, however, would be changed by the formation of a canal between the Forth and the Clyde, enabling ships of war freely to pass from the one sea to the other. Such a canal would be only thirty miles in length, and would be capable of being traversed in from five to six hours. In this way the naval base at St. Margaret's Hope would operate as a naval base for the defence of the West coast of Scotland. It would be in direct water communication with any fleet operating on the West coast, and would be able to replenish it with ammunition, whilst vessels damaged on the West coast could proceed through the canal to St. Margarets' Hope to be refitted and repaired. Similarly the East coast of Scotland would be brought into direct water communication with the Clyde and West coast of Scotland, and with the North of Ireland. The fleet damaged on the East coast would be in direct water communication with the shipbuilding yards and graving docks on the Clyde, and even at Belfast, which might all in a time of emergency be utilised to repair and refit ships of war. There would be no chance of the fleet being at any time hopelessly blockaded at St. Margaret's Hope, because it could always escape by canal to the West coast. Obviously, with such a canal, about one-third fewer warships would be required to protect the inland waters on the East and West coasts of Scotland. The importance of the canal from a national defence point of view is so obvious that I need not refer to that point further.

Equally important would such a canal be in developing the merchant shipping and coasting trade of the United Kingdom, as well as in developing manufacturing industries all along its line of route. The North of Ireland and the West of Scotland would be brought into closer proximity to the Continent, as well as to the East coast of Scotland and of England. From Glasgow to Aberdeen would be 150 miles by the canal as against 590 miles round the Pentland Forth, whilst Dundee would be 110 miles from Glasgow by water. Newcastle would be 190 miles from Glasgow; Hull 310 miles from Glasgow; a saving in each case by the canal of 540 miles; whilst from Glasgow to London by water would be 510 miles, as against 880 miles by the English Channel, a saving of 370 miles.

All experience shows that the working expenses of railways have reached such a point, and are so irreducible, that carriage by water is infinitely cheaper, and in the case of certain manufactures cheap carriage is absolutely necessary. The Imperial and public advantage being thus apparent, the next question is—Is a canal capable of accommodating ships of war practicable? On the Notice Paper I have mentioned that there at present exists a canal between the rivers Forth and Clyde, which leaves the Forth at Grangemouth and enters the Clyde at Bowling. I have mentioned the fact rather with the view of calling public attention to the practicability of the route than with any intention of utilising that canal. The present canal was completed in 1790, upwards of 100 years ago. The nominal depth is ten feet, the summit level is 158 feet above Ordnance datum. In 1816 the dividend was 25 per cent. The canal was purchased by the Caledonian Railway Company in 1867, and they still own it. According to Lord Kelvin, then Sir William Thomson, the original inventor of steam navigation was a man Symington, who propelled a boat by steam on this same canal in 1789, which Henry Bell went from Glasgow frequently to witness, prior to the construction of the steamer "Comet" in 1811. About twelve years ago a scheme was brought before the public, in a pamphlet written by Mr. I. Law Crawford, for the construction of a ship canal between the Forth and the Clyde. The canal was to be thirty miles in length, twenty-six feet deep, and 100 feet wide at the bottom. The district through which the canal was to pass had been surveyed and the report of eminent engineers and others obtained. The summit level of the canal was to be ninety-five feet above Ordnance datum. That height was to be reached from the River Clyde by means of six locks; thence for seventeen-and-a-half miles the canal would proceed on the level, and descend to the Forth by means of other six locks The locks were to be double locks, one being 600 feet long and 65 feet wide, and the other 400 feet long and 40 feet wide. The land is mainly agricultural, and £500,000 was the estimate for the land.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I rise to a point of order. There is nothing in the Estimates for this canal, and I do not know that this line of argument is in order.

*MR. SPEAKER: These details are out of order on this question, but references to the establishment of a naval station on the East coast of Scotland, and the possibility of a canal connecting it with Glasgow, may, I think, be allowed without the details.

MR. CALDWELL: I was interrupted at the point where the details had practically ceased. I wish merely to say that the idea of connecting the Forth with the Clyde is one that has received public attention, and that certain schemes have been brought before the public on a commercial basis. The point I was referring to was that the land was principally agricultural. It was estimated to cost £500,000. The total estimate for the works was £6,000,000. During the last twelve years the working expenses of railways have greatly risen, and the advantages of water carriage become correspondingly increased. Then, by the new machinery which has been introduced, chiefly American——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order! I wish to point out that the hon. Member is referring to the details of a scheme which is not before the House.

MR. CALDWELL: Without going into any one scheme, I may be allowed to say that such a canal would be promoted simply from the commercial and paying point of view. It would not concern itself with making provision for warships or the largest class of merchant vessels, which, whilst adding enormously to the cost of the canal, would not draw a revenue from such vessels to meet the extra cost. The size of the vessel to pass through the canal would be limited, and the canal would only benefit war vessels of a limited size. Once such a canal was made it would be practically impossible to widen and deepen it, so that the present is the time for the Admiralty to take the matter into their serious consideration from the point of view of the utility of a canal in the interest of national defence. I believe that modern science has greatly improved canal locks, largely mitigating their inconvenience. But in the case of a canal between the Forth and the Clyde, it is quite possible to have a canal on the level without any locks at all, and to connect the sea on the Forth with the sea on the Clyde. The two seas were at one time connected and flowed through this very valley. The old channel cut its way through the rocks, and the trough has been filled up with beds of sand, gravel and boulder clay. This has been shown by borings for minerals which abound in this district. On this point I will only make one quotation, that from Professor Geikie, Director-General of the Geological Survey of Great Britain. He says—

> "There is a very ancient depression through that part of Scotland, filled up with various drift deposits, so that it would not be difficult to select such a line as would avoid rock cuttings and lie wholly, or almost wholly, in the boulder clay, and overlying gravel and sand."

The new excavating machinery would make short work of such material. The greater portion of the excavation would run down, by its own weight, on the one side to the Forth, and on the other side to the Clyde, where it would be deposited in barges, and thence laid out on the shores of the Forth and the Clyde to reclaim and make land. By such a canal, the sea at the Forth would be connected with the sea at the Clyde, and there would be no interruption by locks, so that ships of any size could pass. On the other hand, there would be a certain disadvantage in the canal being in a cutting, and having to be approached at intermediate stages by means of lifts. There are other methods of utilising the canal which, if the Admiralty resolve to go into an inquiry, would be brought forward.

The Prime Minister, in answer to a question put by me, stated that the question of a canal had not been before the Committee on National Defence, nor could he give any undertaking that it would be considered by them. The matter, however, is of such obvious importance to national defence that I am surprised that, in resolving to establish a naval base on the Forth, the Committee on National Defence had not considered the matter of a canal. The absence of such consideration makes me entertain serious doubts as to whether and how far the Government intend energetically to proceed with this new naval base.

We are accustomed in these days to have new schemes announced with a great flourish of trumpets to produce a present political effect, but without any serious intention to carry them into effect. The Government seem to be announcing a certain policy without intending practically to carry it out in the immediate future. We would like to know something about this proposed naval base, the announcement of which was kept back. The reason given by the Prime Minister that the announcement had been prudently delayed until the land had been acquired seems rather inadequate. The land is of little or no agricultural value, and it would be interesting to know who was the proprietor? When was the purchase made? What was the price paid? What was the number of acres purchased? What was the valuation at which the subjects purchased stood on the Valuation Roll? Before the sale was concluded did the seller know for what purpose the property was desired? In a matter of this kind the Government would of course have got powers from Parliament for compulsory purchase, and I doubt very much if the country would not have purchased cheaper under a compulsory purchase. It would indeed seem as if the announcement had some relation to some pending matters of diplomacy into which he would not enter. But whether that be so or not, there was no doubt that such an announcement would have considerable effect in leading to a counter-move on the part of Germany and Russia. Germany would find in this new naval base a strong argument for increasing her fleet; whilst Russia might be led to retaliate by some strategical move on land. Certainly there is at the present moment, and for some considerable time past has been, an attempt at *rapprochement* between Russia and Germany. If that should succeed, then not improbably France and Italy would be drawn into the same combination. But whether that be so or not, it obviously is the duty and interest of this country to make the naval defence of its inland seas as efficient as possible, and towards that end I have suggested the connection of the East and West coasts of Scotland by a canal capable of transferring ships of war. Perhaps the Admiralty are able to announce how far advanced matters are in the way of developing the new base. How much money is to be taken for St. Margaret's Hope in the Estimates of next year? Of course Scotland will welcome anything that will give protection in the event of invasion or the outbreak of war with a first-class Power, but if several years are to elapse and no intention is shown of vigorously proceeding with the matter, then I think there will be considerable disappointment, and the effect of an announcement of that kind will not be for the advantage of the Government unless they mean to really carry it out.

Mr. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside): I hope that the naval construction policy of the last two years will not be repeated this year. I think I am right when I state that the orders for armour required for naval construction in some cases were not issued until December. I trust that it will be possible to get the designs out in time, and thereby obviate the inconveniences which, to those connected with construction, are necessarily matters of regret. Some time ago some of the leading firms concerned in the production of armour plates for the requirements of the Navy were invited to increase their means of production, and they consequently did so. I would humbly suggest to my hon. friend that when the question of carrying out the new naval programme comes on, these firms should receive specially favourable treatment in consequence of the way they responded to what they were asked to do some time ago.

Mr. HARWOOD (Bolton): I wish to ask the Secretary of the Admiralty one or two questions with regard to submarine boats. Some years ago I called attention to the experiments which were being made with submarine boats, and I invited the Admiralty to make experiments with that class of vessels. I understand that nine are provided for in the Estimates now. I would ask whether I am right in drawing the inference that the experiments which have already been made have been successful. The other point I wish to mention is about the training of officers, which is really the most important part of the Estimates. The Secretary to the Admiralty stated that officers of the Navy would be admitted from all classes of the community; but I think the system. which the hon. Gentleman now proposes is a contradiction of that undertaking Take my own county of Lancashire. It contributes a very considerable proportion of the expense of the Fleet, but hardly any parent in Lancashire would dream of sending his boy into the Navy, although many parents send their sons into the Army. That is because of the principle of non-election, and I am quite sure that if the country really understood what non-election means, it would have a very short shrift. What it really means is, that it makes the Navy a preserve for naval people. Any person applying for a nomination has to state whether he has any connection with the Navy; and if he has not a connection of that kind, he has a very small chance of even being allowed to compete. The consequence is that the Navy is closed to all except naval people and their relatives. I should like to remind the House that the adventurous spirit of seamanship is not hereditary, but tingles in the blood of all the people, just as much as it does in the sons of naval men. The Secretary to the Admiralty has pointed out that in the career of officers in the Navy there is a tendency more and more in the direction of engineering, and that a modern ship of war is a huge congerie of machinery. In my part of the country the people have a hereditary gift of engineering, and they have the common love of the sea; yet under this system of nomination they are practically shut out from the Navy.

*MR. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. Gentleman that the opinion of the House has already been taken on the question he is now discussing.

MR. HARWOOD: I will only say in conclusion that I would ask the Secretary to the Admiralty seriously to consider if he cannot discover some better method than the present one, in order to carry out his own promise of making the Navy open to all classes of the community.

Question put, and agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903-4.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That 127,100 men and boys be employed for the sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904, including 91,806 Royal Marines."

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.) said that he hoped the Government would consent to report Progress. A number of hon. Members who desired to discuss important matters had left the House on the understanding that the Vote would not be taken; therefore, it would be greatly to the convenience of the House if the debate were now adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Buchanan*).

MR. ARNOLD FORSTER said there was really nothing to be gained by adopting the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman. If Vote A were passed now it would be perfectly open to hon. Members to have a discussion on Vote 1 to-morrow.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

MUNICIPAL TRADING.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [4th March], "That it is expedient that a Select Committee of this House be appointed to join with a Committee of the Lords to consider and report as to the principles which should govern powers given by Bills and Provisional Orders to municipal and other local authorities for industrial enterprise within or without the area of their jurisdiction." — (*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said that when he last had the pleasure of opposing the Motion, time intervened and prevented himself and other hon. Members from giving reasons why the Motion should be rejected. It also prevented the Government from giving reasons as to why this Committee should be set up again. He ventured to resume the discussion because he considered that when a Committee such as this was sought for, adequate reasons should be given to the House of Commons why such an exceptional course should be taken. He found that when a Government Department or any other institution was subjected to adverse criticism, it was generally the custom to give reasons why an inquiry should be instituted; but as regarded the present Committee, neither last year, nor the year before, nor this year, had any adequate reasons been given why it should be appointed to range over the whole ramifications of the municipal life of the country, at the mere request of one or two powerful newspapers, who made *ex parte* statements, and who committed themselves to misrepresentations of local government in the United Kingdom. Beyond, however, being supported by two or three hon. Members on that side, who had always taken a prejudiced view of local government, there was no reason why the Motion should appear on the Paper.

It was interesting to note that the very night on which this Motion was put down as a Government Motion, the hon. Member for South-West Manchester also gave notice of a Motion, the terms of which were in some respects similar. He had expected that when the Prime Minister assumed responsibility for this Motion he would have said that,

Mr. Buchanan.

in consequence of municipalities going further than they should, and in consequence of mismanagement, corruption, and dereliction of duty on the part of the local authorities, it was necessary to submit their action to a jury in the form of a Royal Commission or Joint Committee. That was not done. No charge was made against the municipalities or against the great municipal enterprises carried out by the local authorities. On the contrary, all the evidence collected by the Board of Trade and the Local Government Board, and all the audited accounts of these municipalities, proved beyond a shadow of doubt that they carried out the wishes of the ratepayers, and that their constituents endorsed their municipal enterprises, which were to the very great advantage of the various districts concerned.

It should not be assumed for a moment that he would object to an inquiry if cause were shown. On the contrary, he believed that the municipalities had nothing to fear from any inquiry that might be instituted. All the reports issued proved that they did their work wonderfully well, and so profitably and so popularly that he thought an inquiry was absolutely unnecessary, and would be a work of supererogation. He believed further that an inquiry would lead to the suspension of many useful works already in process of execution. It would involve the House of Commons and the House of Lords in considerable expense, and it would take up a great deal of time that might better be devoted by the Government to setting their old Departments in order, and to bringing the War Office and the Admiralty up to the standard of efficiency which the great municipalities of the country were at the present moment displaying.

On the very day that the First Lord of the Treasury gave notice that the work of these municipalities was to be inquired into, he asked the House of Commons to institute a Committee to inquire into the National Defence. It seemed to him that a Joint Committee would be better engaged in inquiring into national defence and the position of the Army and Navy, than inquiring into matters regarding which there was no demand for inquiry. How many more Royal Commissions and Joint Committees was the House about to set up? They had already actually sitting fifteen Royal Commissions and Committees of Inquiry. He ventured to say that that number was sufficient, and that it placed a sufficient tax on the time and energy of Members of both Houses. When the Member for South-West Manchester ventured to address the House on this subject, he said he spoke, not as a banker, or a company promoter, or a professional man, but as representing the unfortunate taxpayers. He would only say that, as a Manchester ratepayer, the hon. Member had no reason to complain of municipal trading in Manchester, because, from one branch of municipal trading alone, namely, the manufacture of gas, two and a half millions of money had been handed over to the Manchester ratepayers for the reduction of the rates; while other branches of municipal trading, such as tramways, libraries, drainage, and schools had done a great deal to improve the health of the community and to divert profits which, in the absence of municipal ownership, would have gone largely into the pockets of private owners. That money had been devoted to a reduction of the rates, to improving the health and the sanitary condition of Manchester, and to promoting the comfort and pleasure of the citizens.

An hon. Member interjected on the last occasion that Manchester had embarked on a rash enterprise in the shape of the Manchester Ship Canal; but the hon. Member forgot the fact that Manchester only embarked on the Ship Canal when private enterprise had signally failed, and when it was necessary, not only in the interests of Manchester, but of the whole of Lancashire and the North-east coast, that the Canal should be saved. It was then that Manchester, with great courage, stepped in, and to that extent it deserved well not only of the ratepayers but of the community generally. The Manchester Ship Canal had now turned the corner, and was paying a small dividend on its debenture shares; but even if it did not pay that dividend, the amount of good which it had done to the trade of the district by the way in which it had developed local industries, appreciated the value of land, and brought into operation many fields, both of private enterprise and municipal activity, justified everything the Corporation had done in that particular regard. He found that Liverpool, which was similarly situated, paid 2s. 9d. per thousand feet for its gas under private enterprise, whereas Manchester only paid 2s. 3d. He was convinced that instead of Manchester being described as an unfortunate city, it was singularly lucky in having such municipal enterprises, from the profits of which it was not only able to reduce the rates, but to produce cheaper and better gas, and in many other ways to improve the condition of the citizens.

And, it being Midnight, the Debate stood adjourned.

Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD (Somersetshire, Wellington) said that in moving the adjournment of the House he wished to say that the first business to-morrow would be a small Excess Vote of £70 for the Irish Art Galleries. It was a purely formal matter; it had been before the Public Accounts Committee, and it was necessary it should be passed before the Consolidated Fund Bill was brought in. He understood there was no opposition to it.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) asked if it was a second Supplementary Estimate.

Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD said that it was necessary in consequence of a Gentleman making a mistake in his accounts.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:—

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [2nd March], further adjourned till This day.

Adjourned at Six minutes after Twelve oclock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 17th March, 1903.

SAT FIRST.

The Lord Lyveden sat first in Parliament after the death of his uncle.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Dewsbury, Batley, and Birstal Tramways Bill [H.L.], read 2ª.

Bradford Corporation Bill [H.L.], Committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Orders in Council of 12th March, 1903, entitled—

The Foreign Marriages Order in Council, 1903.

The Somaliland Order in Council, 1903; and

The Wei-hai-Wei Order in Council Amendment Order, 1903.

ASSIZES ACTS 1876 AND 1877.

Orders in Council of 12th March, 1903, relating to Spring Assize Counties No. 2 and No. 3.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1876, AND YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS ACT, 1901.

Order in Council of 12th March, 1903, applying certain provisions of the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901, to Day Industrial Schools.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACT, 1865 AND 1869.

Order in Council of 12th March, 1903-amending the regulations as to Green, wich Hospital pensions and allowances to widows and children of seamen or marines killed on duty or who died from injuries received.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877.

Statutes made by the Governing Bodies of—

Queen's College, Oxford, on 26th November, 1902, altering Statutes II. and XXIII., and the Statute concerning exhibitions within the College.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford, on 29th November, 1902, amending Clauses 19, 22, and 77 of the College Statutes.

St. John's College, Cambridge, on 28th November, 1902, amending the College Statutes.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 16.)

BANK HOLIDAYS (IRELAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF **DUNRAVEN**: My Lords, this is a Bill to give to what is the national holiday in Ireland—namely, St. Patrick's Day—the legal position of a bank holiday. It is universally desired by all classes in Ireland; it has not been, objected to by anyone in its passage through the other House of Parliament, and has been accepted by His Majesty's Government. In those circumstances I do not think it is necessary for me to say more in asking your Lordships to give it a Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Dunraven.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO CHILDREN (AMENDMENT) BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act, 1894, and to provide for the punishment of incest, was presented by the Lord Alverstone; read 1ª, and to be printed. (No. 17.)

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 17th March, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISION) (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for additional Provision in the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:

Wigan Corporation Tramways Bill. Ordered, that the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

Sheffield Corporation Bill, Wigan Corporation Tramways Bill, read a second time, and committed.

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY (PENSION FUND) BILL.

Reported, with an Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

DUBLIN IMPROVEMENT (BULL ALLEY AREA) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table.

THAMES RIVER STEAMBOAT SERVICE.

Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. John Burns and Mr. Whitmore.

PETITIONS.

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Northampton; Manchester; Monmouthshire; Herefordshire; London; and Halifax; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Petition from Wakefield, for alterations of law; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING (SCOTLAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Dornoch, against; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Scottish Poor Law Medical Officers' Association, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petitions against: from Colchester; Itchen; Medway; Faringdon; Auckland; Wells; Newport; Devonport; Sunderland; Camberwell; Cardiff; Sheffield; Glossop; Bromwich; Poplar; Carlisle; Salford; and Romford; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).

Copy presented, of Statutes made by the Governing body of Queen's College, Oxford, on 26th November, 1902, altering Statutes II. and XXIII. and the Statute concerning Exhibitions within the College [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 78.]

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).

Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, on 29th November, 1902, amending Clauses 19, 22, and 77 of the College Statutes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 79.]

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (CAMBRIDGE).

Copy presented, of Statutes made by the Governing Body of St. John's College, Cambridge, on 28th November, 1902, amending the College Statutes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed [No. 80.]

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACTS, 1865 and 1869.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 12th March, 1903, amending the Regulations as to Greenwich Hospital Pensions and Allowances to Widows and Children of Seamen or Marines killed on duty or who died from injuries received [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ASSIZES ACTS, 1876 and 1879.

Copies presented, of Orders in Council of 12th March, 1903, relating to Spring Assize Counties Nos. 2 and 3 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copies presented, of Orders in Council of 12th March, 1903, entitled (a) The Foreign Marriages Order in Council, 1903; (b) The Somaliland Order in

Council, 1903; (c) The Wei-hai-Wei Order in Council Amendment Order, 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

DAY INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 12th March, 1903, applying certain provisions of the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901, to Day Industrial Schools [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports. Annual Series, No. 2943 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SHANGHAI (CONSULAR JURISDICTION).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 4th March; *Mr. Joseph Walton*] (China, No. 2, 1903); to lie upon the Table.

WINES IMPORTED.

Return ordered, "showing the quantity of wines, at the various degrees of strength, which were imported into the United Kingdom in 1902 from Spain, Portugal, Madeira, France, Germany, Holland, Italy, Australasia, and other countries (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 134, of Session 1902)."—(*Sir Thomas Dewar.*)

INTOXICATING LIQUORS (LICENCES REFUSED).

Address for "Return of the number of Victuallers, Beerhouse, and other Licences for the sale of Intoxicating Liquors, the renewal of which has been refused at the General Annual Licensing Meetings and adjournments thereof held in England and Wales during February and March 1903, showing in each case the ground of such refusal, especially where such ground was in any instance that the Licence was not required, with the number of cases in which notice of appeal was given, and the result of such appeal, if determined (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 353, of Session 1901)."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE (ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND).

Return ordered, "showing, for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1903, (1) the amount contributed by England, Scotland, and Ireland, respectively, to the Revenue collected by Imperial Officers; (2) the Expenditure on English, Scottish, and Irish Services met out of such Revenue; and (3) the balances of Revenue contributed by England, Scotland, and Ireland, respectively, which are available for Imperial Expenditure (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 256, of Session 1902)."—(*Mr Lough.*)

CASUALTIES TO SHIPS.

Return ordered, "of casualties to ships, in the form set out below, showing the date; name and class of the ship damaged; nature of the accident; the number of persons injured; the number of deaths (if any); the result of any inquiry that may have been held into the circumstances; and time in dockyard for repairs, during the year ending the 31st day of December, 1902:—

Date.	Name and Class of Ship.	Nature of Accident.	Number of Persons Injured.	Number of Deaths (if any).	Result of Inquiry (if any).	Time in Dockyard for Repairs.

(in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 404, of Session 1902)."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Fraudulent Trustees.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield Central): To ask Mr. Attorney-General, if his attention has been called to cases last year of breaches of trust by a sole surviving trustee which came before the courts; and if he proposes to take any steps for the protection of beneficiaries either by a compulsory application of the Judicial Trustees Act, 1896, or the establishment of a public trustee and executor.

(*Answered by Sir Robert Finlay.*) This Question relates to a matter of great importance which has been from time to time under the consideration of the Government. I do not at present see how it would be practicable to make the application of the Judicial Trustees Act compulsory, but the question of the establishment of a public trustee may require consideration if the working of that Act proves unsatisfactory.

Coastguards Service at Dunnottar.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the wreck of the schooner "Benmore," with loss of life, on the rocks at Dunnottar on March 4th; whether he is aware that assistance was delayed owing to the position of these rocks being shut out from the view of the coastguard station at Stonehaven by the intervening headland; and whether he can arrange to have a watch kept on the headland in communication with the coastguard station.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) Yes, Sir, my attention has been called to the casualty to which the hon. Member refers. From the information I have received it appears that the "Benmore" capsized at 1.30 p.m. on the 4th instant, that news of the casualty reached Stonehaven Coastguard Station at 1.35, and that the life-saving apparatus company assembled speedily and arrived at the scene of the wreck (distant about one mile and a half) at 2.10 p.m. Greater promptitude could, I think, scarcely be ensured, but I shall be happy to call the attention of the Admiralty to the suggestion that a watch should be kept on the headland, the coastguard not being in this matter under the Board of Trade.

Public-House Licences—Transfers.

MR. COLSTON (Gloucestershire, Thornbury): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that some benches of magistrates have decided under section 16, sub-section 2, of The Licensing Act, 1902, that they will not grant a second transfer of a licence until after the expiration of a fixed period, in some instances as long as two years, from the granting of a first; and whether, seeing that at least four transfer sessions have to be held annually, he intends to issue any instructions to justices in regard to the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*) I have no definite information as to the action which Licensing Justices have taken under s. 16 (2) of the Act of 1902; but I presume the hon. Member refers to general regulations made thereunder "for the purpose of preventing repeated applications" for transfers of licences. Even if the facts in any case indicated that the justices had exceeded their powers, I have no jurisdiction enabling me to issue instructions to them: and I may point out that the enactment enables the justices in their discretion, for good cause shown, to dispense with the observance of any such regulations in any particular case.

Adulterated Food-Stuff—Case at Norwich.

MR. PRICE (Norfolk, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to a case tried at Norwich Shirehall on Saturday, 7th inst., in which a small general shopkeeper was fined £20 for selling baking powder containing 43·68 per cent. of alum; and whether, in view of the statements of the magistrates, he can see his way to remitting a part of this penalty.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*) I understand that the heavy penalty was imposed in the first instance for the purpose of putting a stop to the sale on an extensive scale of a baking powder which the magistrates were advised was highly injurious to health. It appears that later the court saw reason to think that in this particular case a smaller penalty would be sufficient, and accordingly fixed it at £2 12s., including costs.

Civil Service—Promotion of Senior Assistant Clerks.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury how many promotions of senior assistant clerks (abstractor class) to the second division have been made under Clause 15 of the Order in Council of November, 1898; and whether he can state the number of senior assistant clerks (abstractor class) who have been promoted to other posts, with the further certificate from the Civil Service Commissioners from 1890 to the present time.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) The number of promotions of senior assistant clerks (abstractor class) to the Second Division, made under Clause 15 of the Order in Council of 29th November, 1898, up to the present time, is 110. The number of senior assistant clerks promoted to other posts, with the further certificate of the Civil Service Commissioners, from 1890 to the present time, is thirty.

Dublin University—Women's Degrees.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Governing Board of Trinity College, Dublin, have recently applied to His Majesty's Government for authority by means of a King's Letter to confer degrees upon women; if so, whether that request has been refused; and, if so, what are the grounds of that refusal.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The request mentioned has been made. It has not been refused, but some technical difficulties have arisen on the construction of the College Statutes which have caused delay. I have every hope, however, that the matter will soon be satisfactorily arranged.

Royal Irish Constabulary—Pensions and Lodging Allowance.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is proposed to give effect to such of the recommendations of the recent Commission on the Royal Irish Constabulary as do not require fresh legislation; and, if so, whether the claims for lodging allowances and pension of men of good character and long service who have married without leave will be favourably considered.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative, and to the second in the negative.

Barracks at Buncrana—Delay in Erection.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state how much of the £60,000 set out in the account prepared by the War Office for the years 1901-1902 is for the erection of barracks for artillery at Buncrana; and whether, seeing that the plans of these barracks were prepared upwards of four years ago, he will explain the cause of the delay in their erection, and why the War Office do not put into operation the provisions of the Defence Act in order to compulsorily acquire the necessary lands.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) As regards the first part of the Question, it was originally intended to spend £15,000 on buildings at Buncrana, but it is now proposed to spend a much larger sum. As regards the last part of the Question the site for the barracks has not yet been selected.

Army—Reliefs for India.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War can he give the dates of embarkation of the reliefs for India for this winter; have all the necessary reliefs embarked; and, if not, what is the deficiency.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Including embarkations in the last few days the reliefs have all been despatched to India; the numbers sent being about 700 in excess of present requirements.

Explosives Factories—Increased Wages for Employees.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): To ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether, in view of the accidents that have taken place in explosives factories, the Government will consider the possibility of paying a higher wage than is now paid to those employed in or around danger buildings.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The rate of pay for men employed on danger buildings is fixed on a special scale on account of the nature of their employment, and is higher than men of corresponding skill get elsewhere in the factories. The recent explosions do not seem reasons for revising this scale.

Army Ordnance Departments—Tenders for Contract, No. 2/1773.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: To ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether, under the specification issued by the Army Ordnance Department, No. 2/1773, the contract was given to the lowest tender; and, if not, will he explain why this was not done.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Apparently the hon. Member refers to demand No. 2/1773 relating to sets of equipment, furniture, etc., for officers' messes. In every case the lowest tender for goods in accordance with patterns and specifications was accepted.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Half-Pay Officers.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can explain in detail the increase in thirty-six half-pay lieutenant-colonels and colonels in 1903–4 compared to 1902–3; how many of the total of ninety-two of these officers have served in South Africa; how many have served their period in command of their regiment; and how many have been placed compulsorily on that list.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The difference between 1903–4 and 1902–3 is twenty-six, not thirty-six as stated, and the increase is due mainly to officers going upon half-pay on vacating staff appointments held during the war. The number ninety-two is based upon the number of half-pay lieutenant-colonels and colonels on 30th November 1902, and is an estimated number. Of the number of lieutenant-colonels and colonels now on half-pay, sixty served in South Africa; thirty-four served their period in command of a battalion or regiment; and eleven have been compulsorily placed on the list.

Army Staff Service.

MR. PIRIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state what exceptions have been made to the regulation that officers before being given staff appointments should be medically examined as to fitness for service; and whether all officers have been required to return to regimental duty after five years service on the staff; and, if not, will he state the reasons for these exceptions.

MR. BRODRICK: In reply to the first part of the Question there is no such regulation. The reply to the second part of the Question is in the affirmative, except under the abnormal conditions of war.

Lance Practice.

*COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state how the men of Lancer regiments are to acquire the necessary skill in lance practice to entitle them to the extra pay of twopence a day, as a reward for increased efficiency, now that this practice no longer forms part of their training; and what steps will be taken to ensure their proficiency in the handling of the lance on those ceremonial occasions when it forms part of their equipment.

MR. BRODRICK: Skill in lance practice will not in future be one of the conditions of efficiency on which the issue of service pay depends. With regard to the last part of the Question the matter will be left to the discretion of commanding officers, subject to the provisions of Army Order 39 of 1903.

Canadian Naval Reserve.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it is in the knowledge of the Government that Canada has decided to establish a Naval Reserve, independent of Imperial authority; and, if so, what action the Government intends to take.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The Admiralty have no information to the effect stated in my hon. friend's Question. The establishment of a Canadian Naval Reserve is, however, a matter entirely within the discretion of the Dominion Government.

Russia and Persia—Tariff Agreement.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can give the date when the new tariff was concluded between Russia and Persia; has a copy been received by the Foreign Office; and, if so, will it be laid upon the Table of the House.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): The tariff between Russia and Persia was ratified on the 26th of December last, and was published for the first time on the 14th of February. A copy has been received at the Foreign Office, and a translation of it is printed in the Board of Trade Journal of the 19th ultimo.

Macedonian Gendarmerie.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for East Clare I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he has any information that the Russian Government has objected to the Porte employing only German officers in the reorganisation of the Macedonian gendarmerie; and whether His Majesty's Government intend to make any representations to the Porte on this matter.

LORD CRANBORNE: His Majesty's Government have reason to believe that the Russian Government fully recognise the advantages of foreign instructors for the gendarmerie in Macedonia, provided they are not supplied by any of the Great Powers. The answer to the last Question is in the negative.

Aliens and Wage Disputes — Worship Street Police Court Experiences.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.: On behalf of the hon. Member for S.W. Bethnal Green I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the evidence given before the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration on the 26th February by Mr. Haden Corser, to the effect that business in the police court at Worship Street is blocked by the number of cases in regard to wages disputes, in which, both parties being aliens, all the evidence has to be interpreted, and that, in consequence of these cases, persons attending the court upon other business are kept waiting from day to day; and whether he will take steps for the relief of English-speaking persons having business in the Worship Street Police Court.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): It is of course the case, as Mr. Haden Corser said, that in courts where there is frequent need to employ an interpreter the work of the court is sometimes delayed; but I do not see my way to take any steps in the matter until there has at least been an opportunity of considering the Report of the Royal Commission now dealing with the question of alien immigration.

Denaby and Cadeby Collieries Strike.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether he is aware that for the past thirty-six weeks a strike has existed between the owners of the Denaby and Cadeby Collieries and three or four thousand of their workmen; and whether, in view of the distress occasioned by reason of this dispute, he will forthwith put into operation Clause 2, Sub-section (b) of the Conciliation Act of 1896.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I am fully aware of this deplorable dispute which has been in progress for many weeks, and which, as I am informed, is now being continued against the advice of the men's Union. The Board of Trade have communicated both with the Company and the Union, and do not gather that either of them is desirous of their intervention. No application has reached me from the men actually on strike. I need hardly say that the services of the Department are fully at the disposal of the parties, but it is obvious that the difficulty of successful mediation is greatly increased by the refusal of the men to be guided by their own Union. I am making further inquiries.

MR. MARKHAM: As the men repudiate their Union, will the right hon. Gentleman communicate with the men's committee?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I cannot say more than that I am making further inquiries.

Cremation Act—Death Certificates.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been directed to the recent Report of a Departmental Committee on the regulations to be made under the Cremation Act, 1902, and to the views expressed by the Committee as to the defects of the present system of death certification; and whether he will introduce a Bill during the present session to carry out the recommendations of the Select Committee of 1893 on death certification.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I am aware of the Report of the Departmental Committee referred to by the hon. Member. The recommendations of the Select Committee on death certification have been under my consideration, but I am afraid I do not see any prospect of my being able to introduce a Bill on the subject during the present session.

International Postage Rates.

MR. TOULMIN (Lancashire, Bury): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that arrangements exist between several of the countries of Europe whereby special postal privileges are secured, amounting in some cases to the difference, for a letter of 8¾ ozs., between 2½d. compared with 3s. 9d. from this country; and will he consider the advisability of entering into negotiations to secure similar advantages for English commercial firms.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I am aware of the arrangement to which the Question seems particularly to refer—namely that between Germany and Austria-Hungary, under which the domestic rate of postage in each country is applicable to correspondence passing from one to the other. But I am not prepared to make proposals for a general reduction of postage between this and foreign countries to our domestic rates.

Constitution of the Board of Trade.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will state what form the Government inquiry to be instituted with a view of rearranging the duties and functions of existing Departments of the Board of Trade and other offices will take.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The inquiry will be in the nature of a Departmental inquiry—that is to say, an inquiry instituted by the Treasury, but not necessarily conducted by officials.

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Committee.

1. "That, in the case of the Watford and Edgware Railway Bill, Petition for dispensing with Standing Order 129 in the case of the Petition of 'Hubert Von Herkomer' against the Bill, the said Standing Order ought to be dispensed with."

2. "That, in the case of the Thames River Steamboat Service, Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that Clause 27 be struck out of the Bill:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

3. "That, in the case of the Coventry Electric Tramways Bill, Petition for additional Provision, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to introduce their additional Provision if the Committee on the Bill think fit."

4. "That, in the case of the South Staffordshire Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 1A, and 1B be struck out of the Bill:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

5. "That, in the case of the Wakefield and District Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramway No. 1 be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the Ardsley East and West District Council be proved before the Committee on the Bill:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

6. "That, in the case of the Tynemouth and District Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 1A, 1B, 2, 3, 4, 4A, 5, 5A, 5B, 6, and 7 be struck out of the Bill:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

7. "That, in the case of the Shepshed Urban District Gas Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

8. "That, in the case of the South Lancashire Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 3 and 4 be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the Atherton Urban District Council be proved before the Committee on the Bill: That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

9. "That in the case of the Macclesfield and District Electric Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with-—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13A, 17, and 17A be struck out of the Bill:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

10. "That, in the case of the Hove, Worthing, and District Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18 be struck out of the Bill:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

11. "That, in the case of the Manchester Southern Tramways (Cheshire) Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 2, and 3 be struck out of the Bill, unless the necessary consents of the local and road authorities be proved before the Committee on the Bill:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

12. "That, in the case of the Manchester Southern Tramways (Lancashire) Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with: —That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 7, 8, and 9 be struck out of the Bill, unless the necessary consents of the local and road authorities to the said Tramways be proved before the Committee on the Bill:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

13. "That, in the case of the Gosport, Fareham, and Cosham Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 be struck out of the Bill, unless the necessary consents of the local and road authorities be proved before the Committee on the Bill:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

14. "That, in the case of the Hammersmith, City, and North-East London Railway Petition for leave to deposit a Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought not to be dispensed with."

First thirteen resolutions agreed to.

Report to lie upon the Table.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

James Henry Mussen Campbell, esquire, for Dublin University (Trinity College).

NEW BILL.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To amend and enlarge the powers of The Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act, 1886, and The Congested Districts (Scotland) Act, 1897, and to facilitate the acquirement of land for Crofters' Holdings within Congested Districts in Scotland," presented by Mr. John Dewar; supported by Mr. Thomas Shaw, Mr. Weir and Mr. Cathcart Wason; to be read a second time upon Friday, 8th May, and to be printed. [Bill 107.]

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES (EXCESS), 1901-2.

1. £77 15s. 5d., National Gallery of Ireland.

(2.30.) **Mr. GIBSON BOWLES** (Lynn Regis) said he thought it was nothing else than scandalous that the Minister in charge of the Vote should try to get it through without a word. The Vote was one which the Committee ought not to grant in view of the statement made by the Controller and Auditor-General. The Secretary to the Treasury well knew that any excess Vote required explanation and defence. An excess was a serious financial error. It meant that the Department concerned had expended more than it was authorised to expend by the House, and, therefore, the Secretary to the Treasury had no right to seek to get the Vote through by merely raising his hat; indeed, he had not done so much, for he had no hat on. It was almost scandalous that he should adopt such a course. The Vote was for a sum of £77 15s. 8d., excess under the head of the "National Gallery of Ireland," and it would be well that the Committee should be made acquainted with the comments of the Controller and Auditor-General upon it. When he had elicited a statement on that point from the Secretary to the Treasury, he would ask the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee whether that body had examined that excess Vote. He very much regretted on this occasion that he was not a member of the Committee, but, having served upon it eight or nine years, he felt that the time had arrived when he ought to take his discharge. Now what had the Controller and Auditor-General to say on the point? He complained, in the first instance, that accounts which should have reached him before the 30th November were not received before the 31st December. Why was that irregularity committed? Again, it was admitted that one item of £55, which should have been charged to last year's account, was included in this year's account by error, so that the former year's account showed a surplus instead of a deficit.

The fact was, every kind of irregularity had been committed in connection with that account; it was sent in too late, and what should have been treated as a deficit had been converted into a surplus. Then the Controller went on to point out that this particular accounting officer had had his attention drawn from time to time to repeated delays in rendering the monthly account. Why had those delays been allowed? The Controller further complained that at the present date he had not been furnished with part of the account for the year 1902, and that he was therefore unable to satisfy himself that the accounts for 1901–2 had not been affected by the postponement of payments chargeable to that year. Further, there was a complaint of delay in paying in sums received as admission fees. The Committee would see there had been a series of financial irregularities, improprieties, and even misfeasances, on the part of this particular accounting officer. Although the amount involved was small the principle at stake was important, for every one of these improprieties struck at the very root of our financial system. Why had these irregularities been allowed to continue for two or three years? Had the Public Accounts Committee inquired closely into the reasons for the excess; and what action had they taken in regard to the official whose laches had thus been pointed out?

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HAYES FISHER, Fulham) said that nobody wished more than he did that the hon. Member for King's Lynn had remained a Member of the Public Accounts Committee. If he had done so he would surely have modified some of the language he had used. That Committee had gone fully into all the circumstances of that small excess Vote, and had come unanimously to a conclusion. It made a report to the House which was accessible to all hon. Members.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Where is it? My hon. friend is in error. It is not accessible to any Member of the House at this moment.

SIR A. HAYTER (Walsall): It has been laid on the Table, but it has not yet been distributed.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Then postpone the Vote.

*MR. HAYES FISHER said the Public Accounts Committee on the previous Friday went thoroughly into the whole question. They all felt that an Excess Vote was a matter which required serious investigation, and after a long deliberation they decided to administer a reprimand to the accounting officer who undoubtedly was at fault in not rendering proper accounts. It was not the first time that this officer had fallen under the strictures of the Public Accounts Committee, and perhaps it was due to the fact that he was a gentleman of great artistic temperament who had no love for accurate accounting. The Public Accounts Committee placed on record their dissatisfaction with the conduct of the accounting officer—Sir Walter Armstrong. Sir Walter was a gentleman who had done enormous service to the gallery in Dublin, and perhaps they ought not to expect too much from him in the way of arithmetic. But they had expressed their displeasure and reprimanded him. The Controller and Auditor-General also had reprimanded him, and there was reason to believe that Sir Walter would in future give this matter his attention. But if he did not, the Treasury had given an undertaking that they would see the accounts were duly rendered. They did not wish to lose the services of Sir Walter Armstrong merely because he was a dilatory and inactive accountant, and therefore they had accepted the assurance of the Treasury that in future the accounts should be rendered at the proper time.

SIR A. HAYTER, as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, said he shared with the Secretary to the Treasury his deep regret that the Committee on Public Accounts had no longer the assistance of his hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn, who had done such excellent service, particularly before the Public Expenditure Committee last session, and who had always so very readily given his assistance to the Committee. In regard to the particular Vote under discussion he might say that it was discussed at a very full meeting of the Committee last Friday. They went thoroughly into the question and found that the difficulty was due to the fact that a man very intelligent in his own department in the artistic world, was exceedingly bad at keeping accounts. They therefore decided to administer to him a serious reprimand, and they were satisfied with the assurance of the Treasury that no similar laches should be allowed in the future.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES, accepting this explanation as satisfactory, insisted on the duty of the Treasury to see that accounts were duly rendered. He added that, in view of the necessity of getting this Vote before the end of the financial year, he would not press his objection.

Vote agreed to.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903-4.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £6,312,800, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Wages, etc., to Officers, Seamen and Boys, Coast Guard, and the Royal Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

*MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.) said the Secretary to the Admiralty, in introducing the Estimates, stated that they were of a "magnitude unparalleled in peace or war." That was a very serious statement indeed—probably the most serious ever made with regard to either the Army or the Navy Estimates. He went on to say that—

> "As a citizen, I cannot help sharing the regret, which I am sure every Member of this House must feel, that the bitter competition and rivalry among the nations continues, and makes this enormous, unproductive expenditure a necessary burden."

Then, resuming his official character, the Secretary to the Admiralty continued—

> "We (the Board of Admiralty) take no pride in, and have no exultation over, the magnitude of these Estimates."

In that, of course, the Committee would entirely agree. No public Department, and no individual official of a Department, could take what would be an unreasonable pride in the magnitude of Estimates simply because of their largeness. But what they did want, and what they did not get, and what they had a right to receive, was some defence or some explanation of the reasons for these enormous Estimates. The hon. Gentleman had admitted that they were of a "magnitude unparalleled in peace or war," and that the increase amounted to over £3,000,000. There were two points he wished to make in regard to that increase. First, the Estimates not only represented much higher figures than had ever before been presented, but a rate of increase quite unprecedented; and secondly, neither in the Estimates nor in the Speech of the Secretary to the Admiralty, nor in the Memorandum of the First Lord had they a complete statement of the whole estimated naval expenditure for the year.

Now with regard to his first point, the increase, as he had said, was a very serious one, amounting to over £3,000,000 as compared with last year. It was no less than an increase of 10 per cent., and the Secretary to the Admiralty had himself called attention to the fact that on Vote 8 alone they had an increase of £2,250,000 thereby bringing it up to a figure which was unprecedented in time of peace—*i.e.*, over £17,000,000 for the coming year. And that was not the worst of it. Although there was an increase of 10 per cent. in the whole Estimate, the increase in one important item was very much larger. Last year £700,000 was asked for the building of new ships, but the demand now was for over £1,100,000, an increase of 50 or 60 per cent. Of course our Navy Estimates had been growing rapidly during the last ten years, but never before had they gone up at that rate. The Works Vote showed an increase of 36 per cent. for the present year, and that also had a certain bearing on Vote 8. Surely, in the interesting speech which the hon. Member delivered on the preceding day, he might have made a more specific allusion to the figures he was presenting to the House, and have given special reason for the much more rapid increase than ordinary in the figures. They wanted to ascertain whether anything had occurred, or was occurring, which necessitated that tremendous increase in their expenditure. They ought therefore to have had from the Secretary to the Admiralty, or from some other occupant of the Treasury Bench, some explanation of this sudden and most alarming increase in their naval expenditure.

Not only did they find a more rapid growth in the rate of increase, but they had further to complain that they had not had from the Secretary to the Admiralty a complete statement of what was to be the total naval expenditure for the current year. On the preceding day, at Question time, he asked the hon. Gentleman a question about the introduction of the Naval Works Bill. The hon. Gentleman misunderstood the object of the Question, because he apparently imagined that details were being asked for of a Bill which had not yet been introduced. The object of the Question, however, was to secure some general idea as to what was to be the full naval expenditure for the year. He would remind the hon. Gentleman that when Lord Goschen was First Lord of the Admiralty he usually gave information to the House with regard to Naval Works Bills upon two points. First, he used to tell it what had beent he issues from the Treasury during the current year, and what there was in hand, and, secondly, he used to say whether there was to be a Naval Works Bill introduced, and, roughly, how much was to be asked for under it. That gave the House an opportunity of knowing in general outline what was to be the amount of naval expenditure. If his memory did not fail him, the system of Naval and Military Works Bills began ten years ago. In 1896, a Naval Works Bill was introduced and passed before the close of the financial year. In subsequent years it was introduced at a fairly favourable period of the Session for the consideration of the House of Commons, but they could not help remembering what took place on the last occasion, in 1901, when both the Naval and Military Works Bills, involving a vast increase of expenditure, and a vast increase of the liabilities of the State, were postponed till the last week of the session, and were only passed on the last Wednesday before the adjournment in the month of August. That was not a fair method of treating the House of Commons or the country. It was particularly important that during the present debate they should have some information upon what the proposals of the Government were with regard to naval expenditure outside the Estimates, because they had before them, in the memorandum of the First Lord of the Admiralty, which they were also considering that day, a statement upon various other subjects connected with naval organisation and the improvement of the Navy, which, undoubtedly, would involve a further increase of naval expenditure. Upon that, the Secretary to the Admiralty said not a single word on the previous day, and there was nothing in the Estimates nor in the figures given in the Memorandum of the First Lord from which they could get the information the Committee ought to have before it.

He would refer particularly to the proposed new dockyard and naval base in the Firth of Forth. The Secretary to the Admiralty on the preceding day implied that the money required for that would be provided in the Naval Works Bill. But he held that the House of Commons ought to have on that occasion—which was the proper occasion for it to express its views generally on the naval policy of the Government—some idea of what was the estimated expenditure upon that most important work. In the First Lord's Memorandum they were told that the necessity for creating that new dockyard and naval base was caused by the congestion of accommodation both for ships and men at the home ports, due to the recent increase of the Fleet. He would like to ask: Was that the only reason? Was it really not only the only reason, but was it the most important reason? He did not wish to ask for information which it might be thought wiser in the general interests of the country to withhold. But he did think that Ministers would act wisely if when they desired the country to embark on a certain new line of policy, and particularly one which involved a largely increased expenditure, they, as far as they possibly could, took the House of Commons and the country into their confidence by stating the reasons for their policy, and explaining the increased burden which would have to be borne in consequence of its adoption. He did not pretend to be able to express any opinion on the naval or strategical side of the question. He was no expert in these matters, but on the general subject of establishing a dockyard and naval base in the Firth of Forth, he might say that, to his mind, it certainly had one recommendation, and that was that it was going to be established in his own country. It would be a good thing for the Navy if they had more Scotchmen in it. Long before this new naval base was thought of, he had argued that they did not recruit their Navy from a sufficiently wide field, and he had again and again pointed out that they did not make use of the admirable material which was available in Scotland amongst the fishing populations along the East coast. He hoped that the policy which was now being adopted would result in Scotchmen taking a greater interest in the Navy and filling its ranks, both among the officers and men. That he believed would be a very good thing for the Navy. But his chief object that day was to get at the pounds shillings and pence side of the question. Let him return for a moment to the reason alleged by the Government in the First Lord's Memorandum for establishing this new dockyard. That reason was the congestion of accommodation in our home ports. Upon that subject the Secretary to the Admiralty, in his speech on the preceding day, incidentally made a few remarks, when he pointed out that the same difficulty was felt in other quarters, and that that was the cause of so much work being put out to contract. They had it also, in the Memorandum of the First Lord, that, owing to the great pressure of work in the dockyards, contractors had been asked to complete ships for commission in their own yards. He was not qualified to express an opinion on that subject, but he would like to point out that that entailed a considerable increase in our expenditure, and a considerable addition to the staff borne on the Estimates. The First Lord of the Admiralty pointed out how the Comptroller's Department must necessarily be increased; and they found also that the Works Department had very largely increased, which was directly due to the new scheme which had been adopted. With reference to the increase in the Works Vote, it amounted to over £400,000 or about 36 per cent.

MR. PRETYMAN (Suffolk, Woodbridge) said that was accounted for to a certain extent by the interest on the loans.

*MR. BUCHANAN said that was precisely the point which he was about to make. £200,000 was due to the increase in the annuities for the extinction of the loans already raised under the Naval Works Act. Did not that point the moral of how careful they ought to be in agreeing to the introduction of further Naval Works Loans Bills, entailing further large expenditure.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) asked, on a point of order, if it were in order to discuss the question of works on the Vote for wages.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman would not be in order in going into details; but there was an agreement last night that there should be a general discussion on the Vote.

*MR. BUCHANAN said he had no intention of going into details; but he merely wished to emphasise his contention that when they were considering the naval expenditure of the country, it was important that they should consider the whole expenditure of the year, including the expenditure under the Naval Works Act. The point he wished to make was that the Committee ought to realise from this increase in the Works Vote of over £200,000 for terminable annuities under the Naval Works Act how much might be their contingent liability under other Works Acts. At present, their liability was a very serious one. Taking the Navy and Army Estimates together, the House of Commons was now voting no less than £1,000,000 per annum under the Military and Naval Works Acts for the extinction of these loans. At the time this policy of Military and Naval Works Bills was introduced, they were told it was largely to ease the weight on the Works Vote year by year. Now they were beginning to realise that the period of easing the Works Vote was past, and that that Vote would continue to very largely increase in future years. All the considerations that he had been endeavouring to lay before the Committee pointed to this general conclusion, that the proposals of the Government brought home to them the thought they were apt to forget, but which Ministers should never forget, and that was that they could not add to the Fleet largely at an ordinary rate, still less could they add to it at an extraordinary rate, without increasing the expenditure in almost every Department of the Navy. He would emphasise that point by quoting what Lord Goschen said when he was First Lord of the Admiralty in 1896. Lord Goschen said he would remind the House of Commons of the truism which was too often ignored, that any increase in the Fleet meant not only an increase in the number of ships, but must be followed all along the line of naval preparation by expenditure in other directions. More ships, he said, meant more officers, more engineers, more stokers, and more ratings of every kind. On the present occasion, above all others, the Committee should bear in mind the words used by Lord Goschen.

The First Lord of the Admiralty justified the establishment of a new dockyard in the North, on the ground that the existing accommodation in the present dockyards was not sufficient. That surely meant that they had increased the Fleet in the past at a more rapid rate than the accommodation for the Fleet permitted. Yet the present Government were proposing to increase the Fleet at a much more rapid rate than in the past, with the result that they would find themselves confronted, in the immediate future, with a still more congested state of accommodation in their dockyards. He did not want to prophesy, still less to express anything like an expert opinion on the Estimate; but so far as he had been able to examine the Estimates, and having read the Memorandum of the First Lord of the Admiralty, and having heard the speech of the Secretary to the Admiralty, he ventured to express the opinion that the expenditure which the Committee was now being asked to commit itself to, would entail consequential expenditure which might amount to £5,000,000 or £10,000,000 per annum. They would then have hon. Gentlemen and right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench telling them that on the 17th March, 1903, they committed themselves to the general proposals then laid before the House of Commons; and that the further increase was only, in official language, a normal, or automatic, or inevitable increase.

Could anything be done to stop this increase of expenditure or to diminish it? That was the great difficulty. There was one proposal, a very small one, which he ventured to think was not politically a very wise one. That was the proposal made in certain quarters, and not confined to one side of the House, that they should endeavour to get, by more or less political pressure, contributions for the Navy from the Colonies. He did not believe in the wisdom of pressure being exerted on self-governing Colonies. What was spontaneously offered they could accept; but could anyone honestly say, after reading the discussions at the Colonial Conference, that the contributions offered had been spontaneously offered? The appropriations-in-aid in the Estimates, including Colonial contributions, amounted to something like £400,000 a year. The note appended was of great importance, because it showed that the most important of these contributions, that was to say, the contributions by the Commonwealth of Australia, had not yet received the sanction of the Commonwealth Parliament. There were other contributions, particularly those from Newfoundland, which we had not yet got, and he desired to offer a protest against entering in these Estimates figures like these which were not substantially settled. He was strongly of opinion that it would be a great mistake to press the Colonies in any way for any contribution towards our Navy. If they looked after the military defence of their own country, that was all they should be asked to do; and we were the last people in the world to endeavour to put financial pressure upon them for a contribution for the Navy or any other purpose to the home Government. The people who have the glory should bear the burden of the Empire.

This was really no new question; we had had during the last fifty or sixty years the expenditure for the Army and Navy alternately increasing and decreasing; we were subject to scares and fits of fever followed by cold fits. These alterations in the political temperature were not good either in the interests of the Navy, or the Army, or in the interests of taxation. Sir Robert Peel dealt with this Question in 1841. He then said—

> "Is not the time come when the powerful countries of Europe should reduce those military armaments which they have so sedulously raised? Is not the time come when they should be prepared to declare that there is no use in such over-grown establishments? What is the advantage of one Power gradually increasing its army or navy? Does it not see that if it proposes such increase for self-protection and defence, the other Powers would follow its example? The consequence of this state of things must be that no increase of relative strength will affect any one Power, but there must be a universal consumption of the resources of every country in military preparations. They are, in fact, depriving peace of half its advantages and anticipating the energies of war whenever they may be required. I do not mean to advocate any

romantic notion of each nation trusting to security to the professions of its neighbour, but if each country were to commune with itself and ask what is at present the danger of foreign invasion compared with the dangers of producing dissatisfaction and discontent and curtailing the comforts of the people by undue taxation, the answer must be this—that the danger of aggression is infinitely less than the danger of those sufferings to which the present exorbitant expenditure must give rise."

Sir Robert Peel then went on to urge negotiations with the Government of France, which was the country he had in his mind with a view to getting them to consent to a reduction of the military and naval armaments of that day. He (Mr. Buchanan) now urged that the time had come when the present Government should make an attempt in this direction. The Government must be conscious of the growing dissatisfaction of the country with regard to this constantly growing expenditure, and of the feeling which would become much more vocal of opposition which had begun to be felt towards it. It would be worth their while in their own political interests, and the financial interests of the country, to endeavour to enter into some such negotiations as were suggested by Sir Robert Peel in 1841.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) hoped there would be no attempt made to defer either the Naval or Military Works Bill until late in the session this year. The House should be allowed to deal with such Bills when it could give its time to them, and when there was not that hurry which led to votes being given without adequate discussion. He believed that had the House had time in past years to reflect upon those matters, much of the money voted in the Military and Naval Defence Bills would never have been expended. He took exception to the suggestions of the hon. Member who had just sat down with regard to the Colonies. He protested against the tenor of such a speech at a time when the state of things which now existed obviously could not last, and when this question must be faced. The hon. Gentleman, having deprecated the idea of the Colonies being asked for any contribution, had stated that the people of these islands were alone to be responsible for all the expenditure of the Empire because they had all the glory; but did not the whole of the Empire share with the people of these islands all the advantages? Of course they did, and it was preposterous to say that though they shared in the glory they must not share the burden. The burden of the defence of the British Empire must be borne by the British people wherever they were domiciled. The Empire and its defence should be looked at as a whole. The interests of the British people, not merely the interests of the people of the United Kingdom, were at stake. He had sufficient confidence in the good sense of the British people in the Colonies to believe that rather than weaken, abandon, or jeopardise the British position on the sea, they would do their duty and contribute their fair share to the maintenance of that which was essential to their existence, not only as parts of the Empire but even as separate communities. He therefore protested against the tone adopted by the hon. Member opposite; it was calculated to do an infinity of harm. The Colonies were beginning to realise their position, and to change their attitude on this matter; and this House ought to encourage them rather than suggest that the British people were confined to these two islands.

As to general naval policy, he had very few observations to make. The Admiralty were showing a wisdom calculated to increase the strength of the Navy, and to combine strength with economy. He believed the scheme which had already been discussed to be a wise and statesmanlike scheme. The internal organisation of, and the method of training in, a great machine such as the Navy, could not be made perfect all at once, and though the scheme certainly appeared to be revolutionary to old admirals who served before the days of steam, it was revolutionary only because the inevitable changes had not been made in time. Thirty years ago anybody who suggested the possibility of a change in the organisation or training of the Navy was looked upon as being outside the pale of all respect. Machinery and science had been advancing, and the Admiralty, which had not moved with the times, had now recognised the fact, with the result that this scheme had been introduced. But while the method, as a whole, was wise, he thought the Admiralty had perhaps been unduly quick with regard to the engineers' branch. His advocacy had always been in favour of a common training up to the age of twenty, and it was only in April, 1900, that the present Lord Goschen declared that his advocacy of it was a revolutionary suggestion, and assured him that such a scheme could never be carried out. That showed how quickly the present Admiralty had moved. He had always desired, as a preliminary stage, to see the engineers organised into a Royal Naval Engineer Corps; they would then have presented the matter exactly as the Marines now did. The Admiralty, however, had swallowed the whole thing, and he commended them for their pluck, and gave them credit for boldly facing a problem which had been too long neglected. The change would give rise to a great deal of difficulty and some little friction during the transition stage; he hoped, therefore, the Admiralty would do all they could to arrange matters so as to cause the least possible difficulty and unpleasantness to the existing executive branch. The lieutenants in the Navy had a very hard time with regard to promotion and other matters, and their burden would be increased during the transition period. It had been the custom, when lieutenants had not been fortunate enough to obtain their promotion within a reasonable time, to give them this and that comfortable billet to enable them to serve their complete time and get their full pension.

He congratulated the Admiralty on arranging for the promotion of warrant officers to the rank of lieutenant, but he desired to know whether the sixty appointments to be made available for the men so promoted were to be obtained by denying to the lieutenants of the Navy the appointments they had looked forward to in lieu of promotion. There had been much conflict of opinion with regard to the age of entry. It had to be acknowledged that that point had always been the subject of much conflict of opinion in the Service, but it had also to be acknowledged that they knew from experience what they got from the young entry. For his own part, he did not believe the present naval officers could be beaten. They did not know, however, what they would get by the later entry at seventeen. They had now on board ship young officers of marine artillery under twenty of proved abilities, who had passed all sorts of educational tests, and had some sea experience; they had, therefore, the materials to hand for trying the effect of a late entry system and for facilitating the operation of the scheme, and he suggested that the Admiralty would thus hasten the co-ordination of the different branches of the Navy if they recognised the existence of a considerable body of opinion in favour of late entry, and endeavour to work that existing material into the proposed system. On the whole, his attitude towards the Admiralty and their policy was one more of appreciation than of criticism, and they had shown a commendable breadth of view. There were, however, certain matters which could be better treated on the Construction and other Votes, and he would defer his further observations until that Vote was reached.

Sir ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) said that if this debate was to be conducted only in reference to technical matters he should not have presumed to take part in it. He did not pretend to have familiarity with the subjects involved in the Estimates and Papers presented by the First Lord of the Admiralty. This year, however, there was a very important financial side to this question, and he thought it was their duty to very carefully consider and realise what was the nature of the accumulating and ever-increasing burden created by these Estimates upon the country. They ought to do this without any recrimination, for they all recognised that there was a limit in regard to naval expenditure beyond which the country would not go. These Estimates had shown an increase of a kind which might fairly be described as alarming. He was, however, not prepared to oppose these Estimates by vote. He supposed that although they had not yet been disclosed, the Government had reasons for coming down to the House and taking the heavy responsibility of advising the Committee to adopt this enormous sum of money. He recognised that naval estimates were different from military estimates, because every sensible man must know that the Navy was the one great source of strength and safety to this country. Therefore, he should not like the responsibility of opposing these Estimates. But although that was the case, under the circumstances he thought they were all at liberty to offer strong criticism while the country was comparatively quiescent, for if they did not make some effort to restrict this unnecessary increased expenditure in the future, they might find themselves some day brought up short, and injudicious economy might be imposed whether they liked it or not.

The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had stated that he was prepared to support further increases in the Estimates for the Navy, and he said such increases were inevitable. The new naval base would lead to increased expenditure. They were now being asked for £34,500,000, but they must look forward to constantly increasing expenditure upon the Navy; and consequently a time would come when the purpose of the Government would be frustrated by the excess of the Vote they were obliged to demand. Therefore they should realise this now, and as far as their voices would penetrate they should try and make known what the actual increase amounted to. This year for the first time, in round figures, £34,500,000 was asked for in these Estimates to meet the Navy expenditure. In 1894 the total was £17,750,000, or nearly double within a period of nine years. That was the position which was presented to the Committee. They had not been told the reason why, since last year, there had been a proposed increase of £3,000,000. Also they did not know the full amount of the naval expenditure. They did not know what the Naval Works would be any more than they knew what amount would be required for Military Works. He hoped the Government would not postpone until the end of the session communicating to the House what increased expenditure would be required for Naval Works. He wished to point out that this £34,500,000 was not final, but would lead to further increased expenditure—and that was the financial situation.

Although there was an enormous increase in the Estimates this year, there was no reason to suppose that it represented any relative increase in their naval strength. He had before him the increase of the cost of the Navy in France, Russia, and Germany. He was not speaking of the relative strength in gunnery or in the number of ships, for those were branches in which he was not proficient. But, nevertheless, he understood figures, and the outlay voted in each of these countries would correspond with the increase of strength. While this country in the ten years from 1894 to 1904 rose from an expenditure of £17,750,000 to £34,500,000, France had increased from £10,750,000 up to £12,250,000; Russia from £6,100,000 to £10,341,000; and Germany had increased from £3,250,000 right up to £10,500,000. If they might judge from the sums of money what was the corresponding increase in the strength of the different navies, this country had not substantially added, or had not, in fact, added at all, to her strength, but had somewhat diminished it. Judged by that standard, all that happened was—as was stated by Sir Robert Peel—that when you had a great naval programme in one country it provoked competition, which almost made it unsafe for other countries to remain without making a corresponding increase; they would enter upon a useless competition in the expenditure of money upon something which, after all, was unproductive. He believed the same lesson would be enforced by these Estimates, although he did not in the least wish to say anything against the importance of being prepared for all that was necessary; and things being as they were, the Government were entitled to ask the Committee to support them in this outlay for this year. He thought, however, that in the end it would lead to a revolt against what seemed to be an unending burden.

What could be done to remedy this? His hon. friend had referred to the contribution from the Colonies. He should not like to say that the self-governing Colonies would be likely to increase the small sum which they now contributed for the defence of the Empire. He thought they would, and he thought they ought to do so, but he should not like to put upon them any undue or unfair pressure. He could not help remembering the history of 1754 down to 1774, when one of the things which led to the ill-feeling and constant irritation between the thirteen Colonies of America and this country was this very question of a contribution towards the cost of liberating those thirteen Colonies from the hideous outrages perpetrated all along their borders under the direct instigation of the French. The small claim of this country for a contribution towards the great expense incurred there was well founded, yet at the same time history showed that irritation and annoyance was caused because this country threatened to enforce a contribution by force of arms.

* SIR JOHN COLOMB: Yes, but without offers of representation.

SIR ROBERT REID said if his hon. and gallant friend would look up the matter he would find that there was not an indisposition to give representation to the American Colonies in return for their contribution. He did not think they ought to go beyond what was said at the time of the Colonial Conference by the Colonial Secretary in regard to the duty of our Colonies to contribute towards Imperial defence. He did not believe that the present contribution, amounting to something like £300,000, would be substantially increased. He believed that it ought not to be entered as an asset until they knew that the Colonies had consented to vote it. The point was that the people of this country must realise—and it would be a mistake to mislead them by a vain hope—that for some time to come, and probably for a long time to come, this country would have to bear the cost alone of those immense armaments. That was the prospect before them, and they ought to realise it, and not delude themselves that they were going to receive contributions from any quarter from which they were not to come.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester) said that ten branches of the Navy League had been formed in Canada.

SIR ROBERT REID thanked his hon. friend for the information, and said he sincerely hoped that all the branches of the Navy League in Canada and elswhere would prosper in this particular point of obtaining contributions if they could. He thought we were justly asking for them, but he was dealing with probabilities and not with hopes and aspirations. He did not think any sensible man could look forward to any great contribution in this direction. It rested therefore upon our own people. While colonial governments were bound in duty to safeguard the interests of their own people according as they thought their true interests lay, so we, while not by any means ignoring our wider interests, were bound to look to the interests of our own people, who were specially legislated for in this House. They ought not to lose any chance they had of diminishing their expenditure. Therefore he hoped that there might be some encouragement given to the idea which his hon. friend the Member for East Perthshire put forward, namely, what Sir Robert Peel suggested, that they should enter into friendly negotiations with other nations. After all, there were only three of them in this race of naval expenditure. He did not speak of the United States of America, because the United States stood in a peculiar and different position from all the other countries. The United States had no naval base in Europe, or within 3,000 miles of Europe. He believed the United States would always remain an American Power, holding aloof as much as possible from European matters. But there were France, Russia, and Germany, and since we started these countries had all enormously increased their naval expenditure. Germany had nearly trebled its expenditure in ten years; Russia had not far from doubled its expenditure; and France had made a large increase. It seemed to him that these great Powers were primarily and chiefly military Powers, and they had an enormous drain on their resources through the vast military establishments they had to keep up. It could not be supposed that efforts would be wholly fruitless if they were made with the view of coming to some understanding with them with reference to this matter of naval armaments. No man could command success, but there was no reason why it should not be attempted, and instead of exulting in the enormous power of our Navy—in which he indulged himself, soberly he hoped—for its own sake, he thought they should all recognise it as a means to an end—the safety of our commerce, our possessions, and ourselves. We ought not to spend more money than we could help on it, and we ought to limit our expenditure so far as we could by friendly understandings arrived at with other great Powers with whom alone we were likely to come into conflict.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley) said it was somewhat difficult to understand the issue which the hon. and learned Gentleman had put to the House and the country. He seemed to suggest that some arrangement should be made between this country and the other great Powers by which a limitation of naval armaments might be arranged. But there was one special case which the hon. and learned Gentleman had not mentioned, and that was the means by which he would ensure that the parties to the agreement should observe their share of it. If this millennial proposition, which he ventured to call the suggestion of the hon. and learned Member, was possible they should not appeal to suggestions made sixty-two or sixty-three years ago, when the conditions were very different from what they were at the present time. If this millennial proposition was capable of having practical effect, why should it not be possible between France, Germany and Russia in their military competition, which was draining their life-blood more than naval expenses were affecting this country. Could it be supposed that the statesmen of these three continental nations would not bring about such an arrangement were it practicable or possible to do so? A fact which the hon. and learned Gentleman ignored was, that sums of money—he spoke with some knowledge of this matter—were devoted to naval preparation in Russia which did not appear in the Estimates at all, and if that was possible in the present state of things, how easy it would be, even with the knowledge we possessed of what was going on in foreign countries, for secret naval preparations to be made by any one nation which made itself a party to such an agreement. The first part of the hon. and learned Gentleman's speech seemed to be an attack upon this large naval expenditure, but he had not the courage to say that he condemned it. He seemed to be laying a foundation on which he would be able to say at some future day that he condemned this expenditure. He did not say that he would take the responsibility of reducing it.

SIR ROBERT REID: I said that I could not, nor can any man, tell what may be the reasons of policy which lead the Government to make a claim of this kind. If I were a member of the Government and knew their secrets, it would be a different thing. It is a very strong thing to take the responsibility of refusing to vote what the Government asks. It was not with any mean view that I spoke of the increase of the expenditure.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY said he was not in the least suggesting a mean view on the part of the hon. and learned Gentleman. What he suggested was that the hon. and learned Gentleman seemed to be willing to condemn the Estimates, but not to take the responsibility of publicly proposing a reduction of them. The fact was that other countries were indulging in what has been called "this insane competition with respect to naval armaments," and those who were responsible for the defence of this country had no choice but to make a corresponding increase in the strength of our Fleet. The speech of the Secretary to the Admiralty yesterday, the Memorandum issued by the First Lord recently, and the Estimates themselves, would be accepted by the country not in a spirit of boastfulness, but as showing that the Admiralty was breathing a spirit into its policy of wholesome and reasonable activity. Some hon. Members had occasion to call the Admiralty to account in former years for want of sufficient naval preparation. He did not think that any such suggestion could be made now, because both with regard to *personnel* and *matériel*, the Admiralty seemed to be alive to nearly every requirement that modern science demanded. No one who had spoken in the debate had pointed to a single item of this expenditure that was unnecessary. He was glad to see that there was a large increase in cruisers. There was a certain school of naval thought which suggested that the days of battleships were practically over, and that what was required, especially with regard to our food supply, was a large number of cruisers. A Royal Commission on our food supply would sit very shortly, and no doubt it would take fully into its purview the question of keeping the seas clear in regard to the transport of our food. But in the meantime, without waiting for the views of that Commission the Admiralty were adding in a larger proportion than they had hitherto done to the Estimates for the construction of new cruisers. At the present moment there were no less than twenty-five cruisers of various sizes under construction.

This debate appeared to have turned very largely on the question of the Colonial contribution, both in men and in money, to the Navy. He did not think that sufficient importance had been attached to the fact that in the Colonies actual preparation had already begun. It was said by the First Lord that the Board were glad to be able to announce that, with the assistance of the Colonial Government, the Newfoundland branch of the Royal Naval Reserve had been fairly started. It was true that the contributions both in men and money which had been secured from other Colonies were small in themselves, but the great point was that the principle had been established, and the education of the Colonies on this point was proceeding apace. It was becoming as much recognised in the Colonies as in this country that, for good or ill, we must in naval as well as in other affairs, stand or fall together. Recent experience in South Africa had proved that in case the necessity arose, the Colonies might furnish as large a contribution of men accustomed to sea life as they had made of men for military service. But there must be organisation, and there were many signs in the programme of the Admiralty which showed that attempts were being made to co-ordinate the naval arrangements between the mother country and the Colonies to the fullest extent to which the latter would consent. Of course it must be by agreement, as in the case of Australia, where a certain number of ships were provided, partly paid for by the mother country and partly by the Colonies, but on the condition that the ships should be tied to the coast of Australia. This latter arrangement should be put an end to, because the Colonies must learn to understand—as he believed they would shortly do—that the use of a Navy was for the general defence of the Empire, that ships should be sent wherever they were required, and that the mere hugging of a particular coast by warships did not add to the security of the colony in any shape or form, but paralysed the general scheme of protection.

There was another matter to which too little allusion had been made, but which was of great Imperial importance in the new naval programme. That was the proposed naval base in the Forth. No doubt the dockyards were congested, as had been said by the hon. Member for East Perthshire, but he took a diametrically opposite view from the hon. Member as to what the deduction should be from that congestion; that was to say, that the dockyards should be relieved by the formation of an additional naval base and not by the reduction of naval preparations as proposed by the hon. Member for Mid Lanark. He supported the suggestion of the hon. Member that this naval base on the Forth should be extended and connected with the great ship-building yards on the Clyde by means of a canal across country. That was not a proposition put forward for the first time, but he called the attention of the Admiralty to the fact that the sea route from the Clyde round the North of Scotland to the German Ocean was one of the most dangerous and difficult for navigation within the compass of the British Isles. Therefore, if this connection were made, its strategic advantages would more than counterbalance any disadvantages, including necessary expenditure. In regard to the new scheme for training officers for the Navy, it would, he insisted, be necessary to make a higher payment to the engineers than to other officers, because they would have, to some extent, the distinction which at present existed by which the sons of families who had large private means would gravitate naturally towards the executive branch. According to the Memorandum, there would be a certain amount of choice, but he would point out to the Admiralty that in maturing their scheme a larger scale of pay should be given to the engineer officers, who would stand much in relation to executive officers as officers in Line regiments did to officers in the Cavalry and the Guards, and if the engineer officers were unable to live on their pay they would be unable to maintain their position in the exercise of their profession with dignity.

There were many subjects in the speech of his hon. friend which deserved the most careful consideration of the House, and some to which exception might be taken. One of the latter had reference to the Intelligence Department. According to the Estimates, seven additional officers were to be placed on the staff. He did not know exactly how many officers there were in the Intelligence Department at the present time, but he knew that the amount of organisation in some foreign navies, and particularly that of Germany, was such as hon. Members who had not studied the question could hardly believe. The very telegrams which were necessary in case of the mobilisation of the fleet were written, and every possible preparation, to the smallest office duty, was organised by the Intelligence Department, arranged in *dossiers*, each in its own portfolio. Every possible combination had been provided for. For instance, if war were to break out between Germany and one or two nations, or if Germany was in alliance with another nation, everything was already worked out in detail. He ventured to say that in the British Admiralty they had not attained to anything like that amount of preparation. It was true that the gentlemen at the Admiralty were trying to arrange that as little as possible should be left for decision after war broke out. That was the right note, and the right system of preparation, but whether it was to be attained by appointing so capable and intelligent an officer as had recently been appointed, and by giving him a comparatively limited addition to his staff, he could not say. He urged on the Admiralty that the Intelligence Department might be worth a whole squadron at a critical moment if it were carefully organised.

Like the hon. and gallant Member for Yarmouth, he was oppressed with the number of subjects on which he could speak before this naval question was finally put to rest for the remainder of the session, but before sitting down he wished to emphasise once more a subject which had been debated during the past seven or eight years, and on which his hon. friend the Member for Gateshead, although sitting on different sides of the House, took the same view as himself. He referred to the boiler question. There was undoubtedly dissatisfaction that so large a proportion of ships under construction were being fitted with water-tube boilers, the inefficiency of which had been shown, instead of with dependable, reliable, circular boilers. The First Lord said in his Memorandum that these water-tube boilers would give on a given displacement a larger protective and fighting power to the ships because they were of less weight, and the weight saved could be utilised for guns and armaments. That might be so if the boilers were effective, but when it was found that they were unreliable as regarded endurance and consumed a larger amount of coal, where was the effective gain? The coal question could not be separated from the boiler question, and he did feel that although the Admiralty were going in the direction his hon. friend and himself would desire in gradually abolishing this new and dangerous type of boiler, they were, in order to save their faces, not progressing as rapidly as he and his friend would wish to see. Taking the Estimates as a whole, he believed they would be regarded by the country as absolutely necessary, notwithstanding their immense size. We were breaking the record as regarded new construction. Ten million pounds was the largest amount ever asked for in the history of the House or the country for new construction, but it was, he considered, a wise expenditure. There was much doubt in the House—no one could say how much—as to the wisdom of the large expenditure on the Army, but there was not one on that side of the House, and very few on the other, who had any doubt as to the wisdom of the naval expenditure which the country was asked to sanction. The hon. Member for Northampton made a gesture of dissent. He no doubt would object to every expenditure, but few Members of this House would object to this programme of the Admiralty in order to complete our naval defence. The programme this year embraced fourteen battle-ships, thirty-two cruisers, thirty-four destroyers, and thirteen submarines; an immense number of ships to be dealt with in one year. That was a programme such as this country had never yet seen, but it was a programme which, in his opinion, was necessary in order to ensure the peace of the world.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said of the multifarious questions which they might discuss on an occasion like this, there was only one he proposed to deal with. That was the question that had been raised by four of his hon. friends on that side of the House—the question of the amount of these Estimates. The hon. Member for Dumfries had differed from the other three gentlemen to whom he had referred by the fact that he, most properly, had put before the House the joint consideration of the expenditure for the Army and the Navy. The hon. Member for Islington on the previous night, and the hon. Member for Perthshire this afternoon in his most able speech had said nothing, had not even made the one little reference which they might have made to the military expenditure of the country. The hon. Member for Dumfries had told the House that it was impossible this year to distinguish between the two Estimates and consider them separately and apart. He found himself this year for the first time forced to vote for a reduction of the Army Estimates, but he was certain that those who gave that vote would have hesitated to have given it except for the joint consideration of what would be the future Estimates of the two services to which his hon. friend had alluded in his speech. As he personally thought, this naval expenditure was infinitely more necessary than the military expenditure. He must ask the House to consider, so far as it was right to consider, the grants which they had made to the Government. At the present time there were a large number of Parliamentary elections pending, and it was a curious fact that of the three now immediately pending, the candidates on both sides had adopted the same attitude upon this subject. Take the election in Surrey. He had received the election addresses of both the candidates, and he noticed that they both declared that, in the present circumstances of the country, they would support the large Naval Estimates, and that they would also support the reduction in the Army Estimates. That was the real judgment of the country. The country was really weighing these two sides of the national expenditure, and while they were prepared to trust the Government as regards the Fleet, which led, as he frankly admitted, to a larger expenditure in the future, they were not prepared to accept the military expenditure in the same way.

The hon. Members for Perthshire and Dumfries had suggested something in the nature of negotiations with the Powers, but it ought not to be forgotten that Mr. Goschen, when First Lord of the Admiralty, did make a proposal of that kind on two occasions in this House. On one occasion when he submitted his first programme, and on another in the following July, Mr. Goschen stated in those diplomatic phrases which all understood that certain ships had been built owing to the action of Russia, and he told the House that he was prepared to withdraw those ships if he had an assurance from the other side that the ships building there would also be withdrawn. So far as it was possible to go it was possible we might get France to go with us, because she also was now governed by principles of economy; but he agreed with his hon. friend who had just spoken that it would be a most dangerous thing for this country to come to a binding understanding as to these matters. He could not but fear that anything in the nature of a binding arrangement on this subject would lead to what might be termed a breach of faith, which would very likely provoke a war. While he considered with the hon. Member for the Shipley Division of Yorkshire that it would be unwise and unsafe to enter into a binding arrangement, he at the same time thought something might be done by England and France upon the line suggested by Mr. Goschen. The hon. Member for Dumfries was, as was he himself, opposed to all aggressive policies on the part of this country, but he was sure that the hon. Member for Dumfries felt that our naval policy and programme of expenditure, vast as it was, was not of an aggressive character; that there was in the minds of the people of this country and the Government of this country no purpose of aggression. When the hon. Member for the Shipley Division said there were none on that side and very few on this who would support a reduction, that did not include the Military Estimates. It was necessary for us to face that, and argue the question of whether the Estimates of this year should be actually reduced as he had no doubt the hon. Member for Northampton would propose to reduce them.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, in the speech he made at Bristol made the somewhat crude suggestion that the Shipbuilding Vote of this year should be a stereotype of the Shipbuilding Vote of the last year, and at the same time it must be presumed he allowed that the military Vote should be as large as the military Vote of last year. But the debates of this year had fully secured to the House the large naval Estimates of this year accompanied by a reduction of the military expenditure in the Army. Could anybody, who watched the House and watched the constituencies, doubt but that the victory had been won, and that the Estimates for next year would show that the lesson had been learnt and a change had been made owing to these debates. Last year, the programme to which Sir M. Hicks-Beach referred was complained of as being a short programme; it was a programme which did not keep us in our proper position as compared with other Powers. Would anyone assert that we had passed the point at which our squadrons were to stand? The Mediterranean Fleet has been increased from ten to thirteen battleships. The Channel Squadron had not been increased but had been strengthened in the quality of the ships, and it was in future to consist of eight battleships. The Home Squadron was one on which we could not look with pride, and until that squadron had been greatly strengthened in the quality of its ships, we could not be fully satisfied that the ends had been reached. He quite agreed that this expenditure would have to be borne by ourselves, and that we could not reasonably expect in the immediate future the contributions from the Colonies which the hon. Member for Dundee and the hon. Gentleman opposite suggested. He would go further and say that any contribution we did receive, or which we had bargained for, at the Colonial Conference was not worth having. The military contribution of the Colonies at the time of the war was of enormous value, but the naval contribution was not worth having, because we were bound to spend the money in the Colonies, the ships were tied to the Colonies, and the whole policy of the Admiralty had been to bring these squadrons home and reduce their numbers, except upon such stations as the China station where there were local dangers. The Admiralty had been driven, as he thought unwillingly, into a compromise with regard to the Australian Squadron, which was not of much use, because it suggested to us to get our sailors in Australia, where the wages of seamen were prohibitive. The Committee could not realise what money Australians expected for services of this kind. The pay of the first New South Wales Contingent was 10s. per man per day; but they brought an action for 4s. 6d. extra, and it was regarded as a very fair and proper arrangement. The ordinary rate of pay to seamen was such that he thought they could not look for any contribution in men from the Colonies, except Newfoundland, to the Fleet.

Sir Charles Dilke.

His hon. friend the Member for Dundee seemed to suggest in his speech yesterday that they were putting before the country and the Committee a standard higher than in past years. His hon. friend was a member of Lord Spencer's Board, and he thought his hon. friend would admit that the standard which Lord Spencer gave to this House was not a fleet equivalent to three fleets—not a fleet certainly on all points equivalent to the fleets of France, Germany, and Russia—but a standard which gave us such a position in the world of fleets as would cause three Powers to pause before they entered into a coalition against us. That was a position he had always contended was necessary for the safety of this country; namely, that they should not have pressure put upon this country suddenly by these three Powers to which they would have to accede; that the position of stalemate would make it unlikely that this country would ever be attacked, because of the difficulty of combined operations over the singleness of our command, as against the command of allied fleets. A most interesting paper was published last week with reference to the combined operations of the Mediterranean, Channel, and Cruiser squadrons off the Ionian Islands last year. In those operations, conducted on the one side by the present Director of the Intelligence Department, and on the other side by the Commander of the Mediterranean Fleet, the difficulty of allied operations, which they had always contemplated as an immense strength to this country, was shown; and, from the full account which had been laid before the House of Commons, it appeared that even two sections of our own Fleet were unable co-operate with that closeness which they ought to expect in a single command. No one could read that interesting report without seeing to what extent it illustrated the advantage this country would have by a single command, against any combination that could be brought against it.

The only weak point that one could discern as really dangerous in the future was the training of the officers for high command and the selection of officers, which would give this country, in the event of war, that real unity of operations which ought to be our advantage against any allied Powers. His hon. friend the Secretary to the Admiralty had done an immense deal for the Admiralty since he had been in it. Any one who closely followed the work of the Admiralty must be of that opinion; and he was sure no man in this country was a higher personal believer in the necessity for the higher training of officers, and for care in the selection of officers, than his hon. friend. There might be doubts as to boilers or guns, but they could be corrected from time to time, and they had the example of other countries to guide them. But with regard to the operations of the great officers of the Fleet, they were conducted in the dark, and no criticism could adequately control them. The responsibility must rest personally on the Board of Admiralty; it was a very high and a very grave responsibility; and it was the only real point of doubt that remained. His hon. friend made a convert of the Prime Minister to his views; and he was able, on three occasions, to state the Prime Minister's full acceptance of that principle, regarding which they had agreed with his hon. friend in the past. He could not but believe that under the care and suggestion of his hon. friend the only doubt would be removed, and that they might feel that the enormous sums of money which they were necessarily called upon to pay would be put to the best end, and would be used by the most capable men.

*Mr. YERBURGH (Chester) said he should like to state why, although he had voted for a reduction of the Army Estimates, he now intended to vote for such very large and unexampled Navy Estimates. He did so because his first consideration was the efficiency of the Navy, and its aptitude to carry out any operations that it might be called upon to perform. On this point he would say that it was extremely probable that the limit of expenditure had not yet been reached. He wished to say with the hon. Member for Dumfries Burghs that they should not deal with their great Navy, of which they were all so proud, in any spirit of boastfulness, but rather in that sober, steady spirit of Englishmen, who looked upon it as a system of insurance against the dangers of war. In connection with the point that had been raised by hon. Members opposite as to contributions by the Colonies to the Imperial Navy, it might interest the Committee to know that in Canada there was a growing feeling in favour of the necessity of some contribution to the Imperial Navy. In that connection he would say that, of course, the sentiment of contributing to the expense of the Imperial Navy was not a plant they could force in a hothouse atmosphere. It should be nourished in the free air of public opinion. From reports he had read he believed that it was not only the opinion of "the man in the street" in Canada, but also the opinion of the intellectual and commercial classes that, after all, Canada should look beyond her own shores and should consider the advisability and necessity of giving some contribution to the expense of the Imperial Navy, which would have to bear so large a share in the protection of her interests should they be placed in peril. Apart from the expense they were called upon to face they should never lose sight of the fact that, with reference to the Navy, they could never improvise anything. They could not improvise a battleship, or a cruiser, or a destroyer. That was a serious factor, and in considering the various operations which the Navy might have to undertake they should never lose sight of the fact that the force with which they entered on a war was the force with which they would have to carry that war through. That fact must have a strong influence on all who were responsible for framing the Estimates which were submitted to the House of Commons.

There was another point which bore on the question, and that was not only the size of the Navy and its preparation for war, but what Captain Mahan called its "preparedness for war." Preparation for war was the provision of guns and material; preparedness for war was the provision of trained men to work the ships on the day of battle, and of officers who would have to direct the men. Captain Mahan said that no country was properly prepared for war unless it had all the preparedness as well as the preparation for war. It is most essential to this country that it should have both, more essential than ever it was before, because the Navy was not now supreme, as it was in the days of the Napoleonic wars. Now it had only relative superiority, and how long it would maintain superiority at its present level it was difficult to say; but that pointed to the fact that this country, above all other nations, must be prepared for war in all respects. He thought the Government had not left these important points out of mind. He thought also the Committee would agree with what the First Lord of the Admiralty said in his Memorandum, that the thanks of the country were due to the right hon. Member for Berwickshire and his colleagues for the admirable service they had rendered in connection with the Naval Reserve; and, in his opinion, their report was a very solid contribution to an extremely difficult and thorny question. There was another question which bore upon the question of preparedness, and that was the position of naval officers. He had taken the opportunity of gathering the opinions of men qualified to judge, and, looking at the Admiralty scheme broadly, it appeared to him that it was a natural evolution of the system that began with the development of steam. Everything on a battleship was now done by machinery, and it appeared to him to be only common sense that naval officers should be in a position to control and regulate machinery in their ships. He would not touch on the question of patronage, or the age of entry, but his own individual opinion was that the earlier a boy was taken the better; and he could not accept the argument for the moment that a boy who was put aside because he was in any way unfitted for the Service would be in any way injured, because the education he would receive would be of great service to him.

There were other points on which he would like to touch. One was that which was raised by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean with reference to strengthening the Mediterranean Fleet. The views put forward three or four years back had proved to be correct, as the Admiralty had recognised the expediency of strengthening that Fleet, and were still continuing the process. With regard to manœuvres it was perfectly obvious that it must be an enormous advantage to any officer who might be called upon to command a Fleet in time of war to have had the opportunity of manœuvring that Fleet in time of peace, and he could not conceive any better school for an officer than such manœuvres as had recently taken place. He congratulated the Admiralty on having recognised the great value of the submarine. Through the experiments conducted by the United States and France it had been conclusively proved that the submarine was a most dangerous engine of war. It was really a mine which could operate over an enormous field; it could steer a very steady course and arrive at its destination absolutely unseen; and, according to responsible authorities, its development would practically destroy the whole system of the protection of ports by fortresses and heavy guns. That was a very serious question for this country, and certainly had a strong bearing on all the propositions put forward in this House for the defence of the country against raid or attack. There were two other points to which he had desired to refer, but, as he understood an hon. Member intended to raise the question of gunnery, he would simply ask whether the Mediterranean Fleet were fitted with the latest development of the 6-inch gun, whether they had telescopic sights, and whether they were in all respects up-to-date.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said the Committee were in the unfortunate position, owing to the exigencies of business, of having to consider the largest Navy Estimates ever presented in the shortest time ever allotted for the purpose. The debate had very wisely been confined to the question of expenditure, and it was to that question he would direct his remarks. To those who might take umbrage at what he was going to say he desired to make a plea on his own behalf, and that was—that nobody could say that during the last seven years he had been an unfriendly critic of the Navy Estimates, or that he had ever failed to stand up in vindication of the true prerogative of the Admiralty in all matters of naval policy. But on the present occasion the amount asked for was so enormous that extra caution and consideration were required, and the questions involved in the Estimates were of such a character that they had to be determined, not by naval opinion alone, but by the deliberate opinion of the Government as a whole, and by the opinion of hon. Members of this House. Ten years ago the total of the Navy Estimates was a little over £14,000,000; this year they were £34,500,000, or, adding £1,500,000 for the Naval Works Bill, a total of £36,000,000. During the same period the number of men had increased from 76,000 to 127,000; dockyard men of all classes, from 21,000 to 35,000; the Shipbuilding Vote—the most important Vote in the Estimates—from £4,700,000 to over £17,000,000; the amount devoted to the construction of new ships from £2,400,000 to over £10,000,000; and the Vote for men had nearly doubled. The Non-effective Votes alone showed only a small increase, but there was no consolation to be derived from that fact as their increase was equally automatic and inevitable. That was the picture presented by the Estimates of the year, and every Member was bound to approach their consideration with redoubled care. Unless the cry for economy which was now heard in some quarters was a miserable Parliamentary hypocrisy, the Committee were bound to sit down to all the Estimates, and particularly to those now under consideration, with the determination to see whether the expenditure was justified in all particulars, or whether in some respects it could be reduced.

Having made a comparison with the past, he would now, as far as the materials at his disposal would allow, make a forecast of the prospects of the future. There were two methods of calculation. The first was that—if the rate of progress of the last decennial period were maintained during the next ten years, the House of Commons of that date would have to face the consideration of Estimates amounting to more than £80,000,000. The second method of calculation concerned the Shipbuilding Vote, the Vote on which all the rest depended. Up to the year 1893–94, the Navy Estimates were in what he might call a normal condition; all the Votes were much of the same size. The total amount was about £14,000,000, and the Shipbuilding Vote always amounted to just one-third of the total. If the Shipbuilding Vote were not increased at all next year, if it remained stationary, ultimately, though not immediately, the Committee would have to face Estimates amounting to more than £50,000,000. That was the prospect for the future, and no man was entitled to discuss the Estimates as though they involved no further expenditure. With either method of calculation the prospect was a serious one, and he desired to make one or two suggestions in regard thereto. Whether the expenditure increased at the rate which had prevailed during the last ten years, or whether the Shipbuilding Vote remained at its present figure, he did not believe we could go on without serious financial danger. Then he had alluded to the increase in the number of dockyard servants. This enormous sum might be regarded as going altogether in wages, by the employment of a large proportion of the people of this country. There were 127,000 men in the Navy alone and 35,000 in the dockyards, and there must be hundreds of thousands of people in this country dependent upon this Naval Vote, and there were also hundreds of thousands dependent upon the Military Vote. Therefore they had an incalculable number of people in the country who could use great political influence, and this was a serious state of things. They had been talking of normal expenditure, and the normal expenditure recently proposed for the Army was not adopted so enthusiastically by the House. In regard to the Navy there was no normal expenditure as judged by the past. What were the reasons which ought to determine the size of the British Navy? Naval opinion was not conclusive upon this point. It was not enough to say that naval advisers considered that this amount of money was required, because matters were involved in this question upon which the naval authorities knew no more than other people. One governing consideration was the preparation made by other Powers, and they had heard a great deal about that. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean admitted that the programme of Lord Spencer, ten years ago, placed the country in a position of absolute equality with two Powers, and comparative safety against three Powers. The question of the standard was one for the statesmen wielding the power of the Government for the time being, because it meant that they must make the selection of the two Powers, and it was for those statesmen to declare which those Powers were.

What was the objective now? Were there two or three Powers in number? If the other Powers were asked France would say she was building against Germany, Germany against France, Russia against Japan; and each of those countries would say that they were not building against England. The danger of a combination of European Powers was a question for the Foreign Office and for the Prime Minister rather than for the First Lord of the Admiralty; and he regretted that upon the first great naval debate after the appointment of the Committee of Defence the President of that Committee had not favoured the House with his presence. Two years ago the First Lord of the Admiralty stated in the House of Lords that the British Navy was then practically equal to one-third of the entire battleship force of the whole world; in other words our Navy was not simply up to a two-Power or a three-Power standard, but up to a standard of equality with half the navies of the world. He wanted to know whether the Secretary to the Admiralty had any reason to believe that in the course of the last two years their position had been affected. Last year the Navy Estimates were increased slightly, and the year before that they were increased by £2,000,000. Notwithstanding that two years ago they had a power equal to one-half of the rest of the world, the Admiralty were asking for an increased £3,000,000 this year. Therefore he thought it was a pertinent question to ask—had their position altered from what was stated by the First Lord two years ago, and, if so, would the hon. Member show how it had been varied?

The increase was so enormous that they could not maintain the old habit of accepting what the Admiralty proposed, because these Estimates had been dumped down on the Table of the House without explanation, and the First Lord had nothing to say about them except that the Estimates had increased. Upon that point he hoped the hon. Gentleman would have something to say. Another important point to consider was the extent of the area to be protected. A regular official justification for Naval Estimates had been the fact that they had to defend the whole Empire, and the whole trade of the Empire. At the Colonial Conference Lord Selborne pointed out that one-fourth of the Colonial trade was of no interest to the United Kingdom. The Colonial Secretary went beyond almost anything that had been said in the House of Commons upon this point. He said that this country had borne the whole burden for many years, and had been paying for the defence of the whole trade of the Empire, towards which the Colonies had not been contributing. He made that statement on behalf of the whole Government, and he said that the large naval expenditure had been necessitated and determined by the size of the Empire which they had undertaken to govern. Speaking in South Africa the Colonial Secretary went even beyond that language, and, speaking for the Government, he said the time had come when this question must be reconsidered, for the present state of things could not go on for ever. He had never urged the application of pressure to the Colonies, but he had urged that the Navy served the Colonies just as much as Scotland or Ireland, and that they were just as much bound to make compensation for benefits received as Scotland or Ireland. It was their Imperial duty to recognise the services rendered at such enormous expense by people who were poorer than they were, and who could not afford even old age pensions. He would not, however, propose any forcible attempt to compel them to make a contribution, but he did think that the hypocritical adulation upon which they had been fed for the last two years should come to an end, and that they should no longer be deceived in the matter. That was a question upon which an answer was required.

An extraordinary document about South Africa had been issued setting forth the policy of the Government. That was the policy declared by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, in this House, who said that this state of things could not go on for ever. If that was so, had the Committee not a right to ask the Government now what they proposed to do? Did they propose to go on with this system? They asked £3,000,000 more for the Navy, and they said that the naval burden of the Empire falling on the shoulders of the people of the United Kingdom was already too high. How could they reconcile these things? The answer to this question should be given, not by the Admiralty, but by the Government. He regretted that the Minister who, above all, was responsible, in his capacity of Premier and Chairman of the Committee of Defence, should not give his aid in the deliberations in which they were now engaged. In regard to the question of the Colonies he believed what his right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean had said about the apparent unlikeliness of a contribution from them. There seemed to be no probability of any contribution being offered from the Colonies. He was afraid they would be driven to the conclusion that the Colonies were as strongly wedded to the heresy of a local navy as they were to the economical heresy of Protection, and they must make up their mind to the one as well as to the other. He believed they would willingly start navies of their own, and an alliance might be made with them. That would be a contribution of some kind to this enormous expenditure. That was not a very happy solution, but it seemed to him to be the most possible and plausible one. On this also he would like to hear a word from the Secretary to the Admiralty.

The present state of things could not go on for ever. There was one thing that might be done. The Government might do something to decrease the hostile feeling which their policy had created in the minds of foreign nations. There was no doubt at all about that. For some time it had been a strong, and, he thought, a dangerous feeling. One good thing would be to get rid of the notion that we were an aggressive Power, because, so long as continental nations believed that we were an aggressive and unscrupulous Power, they would not consent to accept the position of naval superiority which we insisted on. Surely something might be done by establishing arbitration as the necessary resort in all cases of international polity. In that way something might be gained, but most would be gained if they arrived a' some practical scheme of inducing the other naval Powers of the world to recognise the folly upon which all had entered. He was not blaming this country more than any other. Surely the great civilised nations of the world might consider whether something could not be done to put a stop to this insane competition. We would be ruined if the increase went on at the same rate at which it had proceeded during the last ten years. He should have liked to hear from the Prime Minister some assurance that the Committee of Defence had thought over the matter.

He had only one word more to say, and he regretted to have to say it. Were we paying for all we were getting? That might seem an astounding conundrum. We were spending £36,000,000 a year on the Navy, and yet we were disfiguring the whole thing by immense exactions. The Secretary to the Admiralty had admitted that a practice prevailed in the Navy by which young officers were allowed to provide, out of their own means, for services necessary in the ships in which they were engaged. That was what was called painting the ship. The hon. Gentleman stated that this was permitted, although it was not encouraged. What inducement had an officer to spend money in that way? His hon. friend said "promotion." The very suspicion of such an inducement condemned the system. In the Memorandum published by the First Lord there was an eloquent sentence in which he condemned the system under which the expenditure on naval bands was charged on the commanding officers of ships. What a monstrous piece of nonsense it was that even this should be allowed. He thought all music was detestable, but if these bands were necessary in the service of the ships the State should bear the burden. It was not worthy of the British Navy that petty exactions of this sort should be tolerated at all. Yesterday the Admiralty were accused of setting up a system which would exclude from the Navy all but the sons of the rich. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would give an assurance that he condemned the practice of allowing these exactions, and that they would no longer be permitted by the Admiralty.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.) said the hon. and learned Member for Dundee in the course of his speech stated that the existing state of affairs was such that it was absolutely necessary for those who thought with him to sit down to the consideration of it in order to see whether any item in the Estimates could be decreased. When he heard that he anxiously awaited the execution of that design, but he had not heard from the hon. and learned Member, or from any hon. Member, any suggestion whatever which could be brought within that category. He had not heard any suggestions at all as to any item that might be decreased. Some general suggestions had been made which he would endeavour to deal with.

He would address himself first to the questions which had been put to him by the hon. Member for East Perthshire, and repeated by others. They asked what was the principal explanation of this great increase, for it was a great increase, in the Estimates. He would point out that there were two very obvious explanations of this, without going into any political reasons at all as suggested by some hon. Members. In the first place, in regard to the new programme of naval construction during the present year, it would be in the recollection of the Committee that the Admiralty were not able last year to lay down all the ships to the point they regarded as necessary to keep up the Fleet. They had now made a return to what he might call the normal position of new construction, and, of course, that was reflected in the extra expense in the new programme. The Committee must remember that he, as representative of the Admiralty, was somewhat severely censured by hon. Members last year for the smallness of the provision, which was attributed to the new programme during the course of the coming year. There had been another contributory cause. The hon. Member cited the great contrast between the expense involved in building at the present time and ten years ago. A great deal had happened which had necessarily enormously increased the cost of building. Ten years ago the largest armoured cruiser we had in the Navy was 300 feet long, with much less armour than now. The present cruiser was a vessel of 11,000 to 14,000 tons, and was almost completely armoured from stem to stern and was also provided with armoured casemates. All this armour was of an extraordinarily complicated character, and exceedingly costly to produce. If that was true in the case of cruisers it was true in an equal and perhaps a greater degree of battleships. The battleship of ten years ago cost £700,000, and it had now gone up to £1,000,000 or £1,250,000, and when they had this enormously increased expenditure on individual ships they found it reflected in the total. This was not a willing departure on the part of the Admiralty. There had been undoubtedly an increase in the tonnage displacement of ships, as well as an increase in the defensive and offensive power of the ships. But it was not the country that set the example in that matter. Everybody knew that there was pressure put on the House and the country by the action of other Powers. It was said that there was a danger of our meeting ships at sea with which we could not hope to contend, and the Admiralty were compelled to give way to that feeling. We were certainly not the first to adopt the exceedingly expensive design of the armoured cruiser. The size of the ship, the armour, and the new and improved armaments, it would be found, accounted to a very large extent for the large increase in the cost of the materials. It was not that we were building a much larger number of ships, but that the materials for the ships were extremely costly. That brought him to the argument of the hon. Member for Dundee to the effect that we were departing from precedent, because Vote 8 bore a larger proportion to the other Votes than it had hitherto done.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that his point was that, taking the normal period the Shipbuilding Vote always amounted to just one-third of the total amount of the Vote, and that even if they did not add to the shipbuilding Vote next year the result would be, although not immediately, that they would be landed in an annual expenditure of £51,000,000 for the Navy.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he understood that the argument of the hon. Member was that we were exceeding the normal proportion in Vote 8.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Necessarily?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Necessarily, because the expense of the material was larger proportionately than the proporsionate cost of the men.

Hon. Gentlemen opposite had made one or two general suggestions as to methods by which we might hope to reduce our Naval expenditure. In the first place it was said that had we entered into consultation with foreign Powers and acted in harmony with them we might have reduced our expenditure. The hon. and learned Member for Dumfries had also dwelt on the point that every increase in our Naval expenditure always meant a corresponding increase of the expenditure of other nations; and that therefore the outlay of this country was rendered nugatory and without effect. That hardly harmonised with the statement that we had been increasing our expenditure much faster than other countries. It was also stated that when we entered into this extravagant increase of expenditure other nations always followed our footsteps. But be that as it might, the argument was carried a little too far. He thought it was obvious from all history, and modern history especially, that there were occasions when money could be wisely and profitably expended on the naval and military requirements of the nation. It was not always correct to say that it was useless expenditure. It was in the recollection of hon. Members that judicious military and naval expenditure had resulted in the redemption of Venice, in the restoration of Rome to Italy, in the consolidation of Prussia, and the relief of Germany from the long oppression of the threat of French invasion; and though he did not contemplate that we should ever be put to any trials precisely similar to those he had cited, it was not correct to suggest that every addition to our expenditure was useless because it was necessarily followed by corresponding expenditure by other Powers.

The hon. and learned Member said that we ought to be the first to make a proposal to the other Powers.

Now, he spoke with the most sincere respect regarding any proposal of that kind He had said the previous day, and he repeated it, how strongly he felt that if any such consummation as that could be arrived at it would be a pure gain to everybody everywhere. But the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean anticipated him in making reply that a definite proposal had come from this House, and from a Government which was the predecessor of the present Government, in the direction the hon. Member desired, and that there was no response at all to that definite proposal. Lord Goschen, then Mr. Goschen, on two occasions made a definite offer of a reduction of our naval expenditure if a corresponding reduction were made in the expenditure then already sanctioned by the continental Powers, but we absolutely received no response to that proposition. He was not prepared, and he did not think the Committee were prepared, to take the view that we ought necessarily to take the lead in this matter. It had been well said that the position of this country as regarded maritime expenditure did not, and never could, correspond to that of the great Continental Powers. We must look facts in the face. We must remember that while this was a matter of life and death to us, it was a matter of indulgence to foreign nations. Our Fleet always had been, and always must be, a defensive Fleet. It could never assume the character of a predatory Fleet. We had quite enough to do to defend our possessions abroad and our countrymen at home. But that could not be said of some of the great navies of other countries. Although he had no authority to speak on behalf of the Government on so grave a matter, he believed this Government were as much disposed as any Government that had preceded them towards any accommodation, which could be relied upon, for the reduction of our enormous naval armaments; but he did not think that it was our place to enter on this path while other nations refused to pursue it with us.

An hon. Member spoke in regard to Colonial contributions to the Navy, and quoted with approval the words of his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Certainly he would be the last person who would be likely to quarrel with an opinion of that kind, expressed by so distinguished a member of the Government; but he thought that they must all agree, on that side of the House as well as on this, that the situation was a very serious one in regard to the enormous burden thrown on this country by being compelled to be the sole defender of British rights all over the world. He had been blamed for allowing the contributions promised by some of the Colonies to appear in the Estimates before they had been sanctioned by the Colonial Parliaments. He thought, however, that he would have been censured had they not appeared in the Estimates. They appeared with an Explanatory Note, which made it quite clear that these amounts were conditional upon the Colonial Parliaments making them effective by their Votes. He quite admitted that some of these contributions might not be made. But in regard to the Australian Commonwealth, he thought it would have been discourteous if we had not given effective recognition to the promise of the Ministers of the Commonwealth, and not had assumed that they were going to do their utmost to carry out the promises they had given.

The question itself was a very serious one. He did not know whether the hon. Gentleman opposite was going to give effect to the policy which he adumbrated, and whether that was the policy of the Party opposite—namely, to give notice to the Colonies that we were to cease to defend them in the event of a maritime war with a foreign Power.

Sir ROBERT REID: No.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Then they were pretty much agreed on this matter. But everyone on either side of the House must feel that there was a real danger that this persistent apathy (he must call it so) on the part of the Colonies was likely at any rate to have one serious result. Whatever might be the view of the Colonies, there was the danger of reaction in this country, and the growth of the feeling that it was impossible to bear this burden very much longer. He was sure that they all agreed that the idea of pressing the Colonies beyond their own desire to contribute to the naval and military establishments of this country, was one which no sane person could entertain. It was a matter on which we had no power at all; and it was as certain as anything could be that if, in the future, we were to receive more generous contributions at the hands of the Colonies it would be entirely of their own good-will, and the result of further instruction of Colonial public opinion to which he attached great importance. But there was a danger that reaction might come on this side, and, when it did come he confessed it would be a very serious day for this country, and also for the Colonies. On that account he could not help feeling the fact the misconception in regard to a naval war which appeared in some of the Colonies, for it was a very serious one. It appeared to be the idea among certain Colonial circles that a naval war could be made a matter of limited liability. That was an entire delusion. If, for instance, the Australian Colonies found themselves, as they might find themselves, in the event of the Imperial Navy abandoning them, pressed by France in regard to the New Hebrides, pressed by Japan in regard to Japanese immigration, or pressed by Germany, which desired to establish some colony on Australian soil, then the Australian Colonies would at once find that the idea of limited liability in naval warfare was one which had no substantial foundation, and that they would not have to contend only with the foreign squadron—say the German—at present in Australian waters, but against the whole maritime strength of the foreign nation with which they were engaged, which would be brought against them. They would find that in that event they would have to expend something enormously beyond any contribution which they now made to the Imperial Navy, and under these circumstances he feared their taxpayers would look extremely blue.

Nor did he think that the idea of separate navies was likely to find such favour as some hon. Members supposed; and for this reason. He was able, during the recent visit of the Delegates, to make a calculation that if the Australian Commonwealth were to furnish itself with the smallest navy known in the civilized world, the mere cost of upkeep would be enormously in excess of anything which had been suggested as the contribution of Australia to our Fleet. He could hardly believe that the Australian Commonwealth was likely to attempt to establish a navy, even upon that modest scale.

The appointment of warrant officers to commissioned rank would not, so far as he knew, interfere with the opportunities of advancement open to senior lieutenants. These officers would assume posts chiefly in the dockyards now held by chief warrant officers.

Although there had been a considerable amount of general criticism on the amount of the Estimates, there had been a singularly small amount of criticism on the details. He wished to make it clear to the Committee that these additions of ships and men to the Navy Estimates were not casual and spasmodic additions. They were all the result of a most careful examination of the contingencies which, in existing circumstances, we might have to face in the event of war. The programme which had been laid before the Committee was the continuance of the programme which was sanctioned last year, and a preparation for that which the Government hoped would be sanctioned in the coming year. He hoped they would be allowed to obtain that Vote that evening, as there would be another opportunity of discussing many of these matters on the report of the Vote to-morrow.

*MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said whatever might be the difference of opinion in various quarters of the House as to the amount of these Estimates, there could be no difference of opinion as to the urgency for remedying the deficiencies or the defective handling of our implements of warfare. In suggesting that, he hoped the hon. Member for Gateshead would not think he was going to enter into a discussion on boilers, but he desired to say a word or two on an equally important question—that of gunnery. His hon. friend had pointed out that they could have ships costing a lot of money and yet that could not steam. He would go a step further, and say they could have good ships costing a lot of money and well armoured, but which if they could not shoot straight were no good at all. At the present moment there were plenty of figures in circulation which gave the percentages of shooting, good and bad, and as they were not questioned by the Navy, he would take it that they were reliable. It appeared that the average of the annual prize shooting showed that for every three shots fired two missed their object, and that only nine ships in the whole of the Navy could shoot at all well and be regarded as good shots. The Secretary to the Admiralty smiled at that, but he would be glad to hear figures in contradiction. He found that out of the total figures 118 ships shot badly, and what was still worse, of the remainder over fifty did not shoot at all. He would ask the Admiralty whether it was the fact or not that there were a large number of ships in the Navy that did not carry out their quarterly or even annual prize firing.

* MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The hon Member stated that ships did not fire at all. There are ships that do not carry out prize firing, but it does not follow that they do not fire at all.

*MR. KEARLEY disclaimed any desire to mislead the House or to impute that non-prize firing ships could not shoot. It was unfortunate that there was no record given from which they could judge how those particular ships could shoot. The House could only go by the Returns, and they showed that 118 shot badly and only nine shot well. What did that mean? They spent money on new construction and built battleships fitted with the best armour and the best guns, and they voted with alacrity £1,500,000 or £1,000,000 for the purpose. Taking the "Bulwark" and the "Ocean," both of which vessels were built recently, at Devonport, and were excellently provided with officers and crews as examples of good shooting ships, he found that the "Bulwark" with her 12-inch guns scored 106 hits out of 155 shots, whilst the "Ocean," with 6-inch guns, out of 163 shots hit the target 117 times. The "Ocean" was taught good shooting by Captain Percy Scott, whose reputation for enforcing efficiency in gunnery was well known to the House, and the "Bulwark" was equally favoured with a commander who took the greatest interest in efficient shooting. As examples of bad shooting, he found the "Formidable" out of twenty-seven shots scored only one hit; the "Vengeance," which was only commissioned last year, hit twice out of forty-four shots, and the "Hannibal," a vessel of great expectations, with its big guns scored three hits in twenty-nine rounds of prize firing. That meant that the two Devonport ships could beat the others out of all time. He emphasised that point in order to show that it was the will power of the officers that gained the superiority. Again they found the "Speedy," which had been in commission for three years, fired twenty-three rounds, and never hit the target at all.

Bad as those figures were, the House would think they indicated much more when they considered the conditions as to range and speed under which the firing was carried out. Those conditions were laid down ten or twelve years ago when the rapidity of fire and range of guns were much lower than at the present day. The range was from 1,500 to 1,800 yards, and the speed at which the ships travelled when firing was between ten and twelve knots an hour. What would be the real conditions under which these ships would fire in time of war? He was told that the effective range of a 12-inch gun was ten miles, and that the guns would carry as far as fourteen miles. He was also assured, on good authority, that the enemy's ships would become a target under the best atmospheric conditions at eight miles, and yet our Fleet were being trained in gunnery at a range of 1,500 to 1,800 yards. Long before our ships were as close as this to the enemy, all would be over, because, independently of the range of the enemy's guns, there had to be taken into account the torpedo, which had a range of 3,000 yards. Were the Admiralty satisfied with the conditions under which the firing of the Navy was being carried on at the present moment? In his opinion, it was necessary to make everything in the way of an officer's promotion depend on good gunnery, and if efficiency could not be obtained he would counsel that compulsory retirement should be enforced. He would also lay down a minimum standard of efficiency, and he thought it was not asking too much to demand that each ship should be called upon to come up to that standard. Too much emphasis could not be laid upon the will power of the officers to enforce good training. Captain Scott was going, or had already gone, to H.M.S. "Excellent," and would doubtless do some good work there; but they ought to have at the Admiralty as the Director of Naval Ordnance a man with full authority to draw up and enforce shooting regulations and standards for the whole Fleet, and he could not help thinking that it would be a good thing to appoint Captain Percy Scott to such a position. That officer started in a small boat, the "Scylla," and brought its firing up to a high standard of efficiency. He did the same with the "Terrible," and made good shooting so contagious on the China station that although the "Ocean" at first did not shoot well, it soon became, under his command, so efficient as to beat the record of the "Terrible." In conclusion, he would suggest that the Admiralty should give good prizes to encourage better shooting, and should make a more liberal quarterly allowance of ammunition. Some concessions in that direction had been made in the last five years, but if more opportunities for practice were given, he ventured to say that gunnery in the Navy would become its most prominent sport, and year by year, ship by ship, and gun by gun there would grow up that spirit of emulation which could only result in advantage to the Navy at large.

MR. SEELY (Lincoln) agreed that gunnery was of the greatest importance. Nobody who took any interest in the English Navy would ever forget what troubles and disasters befell it in the American War when they met the American Navy, which was a very small one, but which, from the superiority of its shooting, gained many small successes over us. Gunnery was of such importance that it was not necessary for him to emphasise it. He desired to address himself to the question which had been raised that afternoon by the hon. Member for Dumfries. The right hon. Gentleman spoke with a gravity which was justified of the large amount of the Navy Estimates, and he had quoted the increase which had taken place in ten years. He had pointed out that the Navy Estimates of this country had doubled in that time, whilst those of the three principal Powers had only increased by £6,000,000. That statement had produced an influence on the right hon. Gentleman's mind which he felt confident would constitute a serious danger to the security and safety of the country. He would, under those circumstances, draw attention to the proposition laid down by Mr. Childers when First Lord of the Admiralty. Mr. Childers, whom no one could accuse of being a Jingo or extreme Imperialist, laid it down that if we suddenly found we should be, at twenty-four hours' notice, entangled without an ally in a war with three maritime Powers, our strength should be such that we should be able to hold our own in the Channel, in the Home seas, the Mediterranean, Chinese, and Colonial waters. That was the principle laid down in 1875. It went farther, and he had always felt was more suited to this country, than the so-called two-Power standard; it gave us a much greater security, and, therefore, more force in the councils of the world.

What was the position of affairs in 1875? Not being an expert, he did not consider himself competent to deal with particular ships or particular classes of fleets or squadrons; he could simply take the expenditure of different countries, and assume that our own expenditure was as well directed. In 1875 our expenditure was £10,000,000, while that of the three other principal maritime Powers was £8,250,000. In 1885 the expenditure of the three other nations had gone up to £12,600,000; ours stood at a little over £10,000,000. The Committee would therefore see that, while in 1875 the expenditure came up to the proposition laid down by Mr. Childers, in the ensuing ten years there was no serious increase, although the other countries were spending considerably more. Then from 1885 to the year mentioned by the hon. and learned Member for Dumfries, the other three Powers increased their expenditure to

£25,000,000, while we increased ours only to £17,000,000. He could not help thinking that that gave ground for thought, and that it was due to our failure during those years to increase our expenditure in proportion to that of other countries that we had been compelled during the last ten years, to increase the Estimates to £34,000,000—a sum which all would acknowledge was a heavy burden on the country. But that expenditure of £34,000,000 again put us in the position we held in 1874, viz., one of greater strength than that of the three other Powers, and he hoped that, if it did not cause a reduction—of which in the present condition of European affairs there was little chance—it would have the effect of checking the increase of foreign fleets which had entailed this abnormal increase of our own expenditure.

As to the hope held out in some quarters of obtaining from the Colonies a contribution towards the cost of Imperial defence, there was, of course, a chance of that happening, and, on account both of the saving of expenditure to this country, and of the spirit it would show on the part of the Colonies, everyone would be glad to receive a really substantial contribution of that nature. It would not, however, be wise to lay much stress on the matter. He agreed that we had a moral claim for a contribution, but by insisting on that moral claim we should run the risk of causing a feeling of injustice and of creating a certain amount of disunion between us and our fellow-subjects across the sea. It had also to be remembered that though the Fleet was maintained for the defence of the whole Empire, it was maintained, primarily and mainly, for the defence of this country. Serious as might be the results to the Empire of a defeat of our Fleet, to this country it would be absolute ruin, and the Colonies were aware that the size of the Fleet was determined, not so much by the size of the Empire as by the size of the fleets of those Powers whom we might have to meet. He did not think therefore, there was much chance of a contribution from the Colonies, and he was glad that the Government had had the courage, even at a time when taxation was undoubtedly heavy, to increase the expenditure to the amount they considered necessary.

Looking at the competition of other nations, it could not be said that we were doing anything more than we were obliged to do, or anything but what, from the nature of the case, and judging by the experience of past years, was most likely to have the effect of checking the unfortunate race in armaments between the nations of the world. He hoped there would be a reduction in the expenditure of foreign countries, but if there was not such a reduction, he was confident that the people of this country would never be unwilling to bear whatever burdens were necessary for their protection. He agreed with the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean that the speeches of to-day had thoroughly and completely justified those who had pointed out the gravity, at a time of such heavy taxation as the present, of allowing any increase of those forces of the Crown which were not absolutely essential to the defence of the country. In conclusion, he expressed his hope and confidence that the money now to be voted would be wisely and rightly expended, and that whether or not the increase of our forces checked the expenditure of other countries, this country would never allow itself to fall behind in the race for naval power, upon which the whole of our security in the future rested.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER thought a reply was due to the hon. Member for Devonport, because he had referred to a matter of great public interest and of real importance. The hon. Member had asked whether he was satisfied. Of course he was not. That was not the attitude of the Admiralty in these matters. It was never satisfied where improvement was possible. They desired always to be progressing. He desired the Committee to understand, however, that the picture drawn by the hon. Member as to the gunnery of the Navy was really rather fanciful. It was true that the necessity for good gunnery had enormously increased in modern times. In the first place, the guns would shoot farther and straighter, and, in the second place, it was necessary that they should be more correctly pointed, because the object at which they shot was farther off. That effect was produced by the extended range of the gun itself, and by the extended effective range of the torpedo. But when the hon. Member spoke of ships ten miles apart getting into effective action, he thought he really was going a little too far.

*Mr. KEARLEY said he had not spoken of ships going into action; he had referred to an enemy's ship affording a target at eight miles.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER believed that a ship would be actually hull down at that distance.

Mr. KEARLEY disagreed.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER (continuing) said he would not quarrel over that point, as they were agreed on other matters of far greater importance. It was well known that ships could profitably engage at a distance of 6,000 yards, and he would not like it to be thought that the Admiralty were unaware of that fact. As the hon. Member had drawn an alarming picture of what he called the bad gunnery of the Navy, it would be well for the Committee to understand what this bad gunnery really meant. It was true that the exercise known as prize-firing formed a part, but a part only, of the firing on every ship. It was done under artificial conditions, with the ship steaming at twelve knots, and in comparatively fine weather. It being necessary to renew the target very often, this firing could be carried out only under certain favourable conditions. There were certain ships which, because of employment on other duties, or from other causes, had not carried out their prize-firing during the year—the hon. Member had mentioned the number, large and small, as fifty. But the Committee should not attach very great importance to that circumstance. The fact was perfectly well known to the Admiralty; they were fully aware whether a ship had or had not done its prize-firing, and, if it had not, they knew the reasons which had prevented it. Prize-firing formed only a part, and by no means the most important part, of the gunnery of a ship in each year. The hon. Member had said—and this probably was the point which most interested the Committee—that a large number of the ships which had fired had secured very bad results, and also that the value of a ship which made thirty-six hits was immensely superior to that of a ship making twelve hits; in fact, that the one would practically annihilate the other. That sounded a very conclusive statement, and was no doubt arithmetically correct. But supposing the second ship fired thirty-six shots, of which twenty-four, although they missed the target, hit the ship, the discrepancy would not be so great, and he undertook to say that ninety-nine out of a hundred of the shots referred to by the hon. Member as "misses" would have struck the ship at which they were aimed. Prizefiring was carried on, in the case of the 6-in. gun, at a target 10 feet high by 20 feet wide, which, at 2,000 yards, was not a very large object; and it was not only possible, but it was the fact, that over and over again shots which passed over or alongside the target, and were properly recorded as misses, would have struck the ship if they had been aimed at one. He would point out that if the "Hannibal" missed a target 20 feet wide it did not follow that she would have missed in aiming at a vessel which was 400 feet long. Really the case was not as the hon. Member for Devonport had described it. The great variety of the circumstances under which prize-firing was conducted made actual comparisons between one ship and another extremely difficult in the Navy, and the circumstances of the day were always a most important factor in the results achieved. The guns themselves, too, varied in shooting qualities. The hon. Member seemed to think that long-distance firing was not practised now, but that was entirely a mistake. Long-distance firing was practised now as it had never been done before in the whole history of the Navy, and in the Mediterranean most remarkable results had been obtained. There was hardly a ship in the Navy which did not carry out long-distance firing.

Mr. KEARLEY: Yes, on shore.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Certainly not on shore, but at sea. This practice was recognised as being very important, and he could take the hon. Member down to some of the gunnery ships at Portsmouth or Chatham where long-distance firing was constantly practised, and he would see there some of the really extraordinary performances which had been accomplished. After a visit to these gunnery ships he thought the hon. Member would be ready to withdraw his sweeping criticism as to the character of the naval gunnery. He had seen long-distance firing which was quite a revelation to those who had witnessed it. He quite admitted that there was room for a great deal of improvement in the gunnery of the Navy, both in regard to close and long-distance firing, but he assured the Committee that this was receiving the earnest attention of the Admiralty. Arrangements had been made whereby a portion of the ammunition could be expended, and was being expended, at the discretion of the officer commanding the ship, and that officer could carry out any experiments he liked subject to certain regulations. Some hon. Members had urged that special attention should be paid to the individual instruction of the men who showed special shooting abilities. This point had been occupying the attention of the Admiralty for many months, and hon. Members would see presently the result of the solicitude of the Admiralty in this matter. The hon. Member for Devonport is giving the Admiralty some advice with respect to the appointment of a particular officer to the post of Director of Naval Ordnance. May I ask leave to say that the Admiralty must be responsible for promotions. At the same time, I wish to make it clear that the duties of the Director of Naval Ordnance were not principally to superintend the firing on the ships, but to supply all necessary Ordnance material, and to regulate the pattern and ensure the best material in the case of guns and ammunition. The picture painted by the hon. Member of the Admiralty giving all their attention to the external decoration of ships, and wholly neglecting gunnery, was a purely fancy one, and had no relation whatever to the facts. Some of the best gunnery officers in the Service were at the Admiralty. In conclusion, he wished to say that he believed at the present moment that whatever might be said of the gunnery of the British Navy, taking it all round it was not surpassed by that of any navy in the world. Great advances were being made in the direction of improving the gunnery, and he asked the Committee not to take this gloomy picture as representing the situation. He trusted the Committee would believe that the Admiralty were as well aware of the need for progress and improvement in gunnery as the hon. Member for Devonport himself.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said he did not pretend to understand the technical questions connected with the Navy, but he looked at the matter as a guardian of the public purse. His hon. friend the Member for Dundee made a very excellent speech, in common with many other excellent speeches delivered from this side of the House. The hon. Member for Dundee had been a Member of the Admiralty Board, and possessed official knowledge, and he had explained that the present increase was not necessary, and that, unless the Admiralty mended their ways, the cost of the Navy would possibly rise to £60,000,000 per annum. Under those circumstances the hon. Member asked, what were they to do? His answer was: "Divide against the Estimates." Many hon. Members talked and complained against the expenditure, and when it came to voting they went out, or else carried matters so far as to vote for the Government. The other day he expected to enlist some hon. Members opposite with the band of economists of which he was a Member, but when it came to a division some of them left the House and others voted with the Government. He did not say that they ought not to have a strong Navy. They had to defend themselves from invasion and keep up communication with India, and they had a large carrying trade; but they ought to be reasonable and remember that they could not go on spending indefinitely. They ought to take a reasonable sum for the Fleet which the country could stand, and make the best use of it. If the

Admiralty did not make the best use of the money then they should turn out the Admiralty. He did not think it was a good thing to have changes at the Admiralty every year, and there were exceptional reasons why they should not agree to the present proposals. The country had now awakened to the fact that £90,000,000 a year upon armaments was very much too much. How had the Government met this? Simply by proposing an increase of 27,000 men in the Army—and that had been carried. If they wanted so many soldiers, they could not have more sailors as well. They could not eat their cake and have it. He would not go into matters of detail, but he put it upon the broad ground that, although they desired a strong and efficient Navy they should not increase the Navy Estimates in the present year because the Government had decided to increase the Army Estimates by £3,000,000. The Amendment which he proposed was that this Vote should be reduced by £373,800. By supporting his Amendment they would not be voting against the Government, but simply expressing the opinion that the sum total spent upon armamentsshould be decreased, and not increased; and if they chose to take an excessive sum for the Army the Government must accept the responsibility and the Committee should say that they would not vote any more to the Navy because more had been taken for the Army. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £5,939,000, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

*Sir WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead) said he wished to explain away some of the statements made by the hon. Member for Devonport, who had spoken about bad shooting. He had spoken to several gunnery lieutenants upon this question, and they told him that the real reason why they could not produce good gunners arose from the fact that the formation of the vessels themselves were too fine, and there were no steady platforms for the guns when there was any sea on, because the vessel was always on the wobble, consequently they could not hit the target. This was solely a question of ship formation. The ships were too fine forward and aft, and they had no middle body to make them suitable for good shooting. That was the real cause of the bad shooting of their sailors, and it arose from the fact that the constructor to the Admiralty required high speed at the expense of shooting, and also at the expense of the safety of the ship. That was the reason why they could not have good shooting. It was impossible to strike at short range, let alone a distance of 6,000 yards.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said that the question of a Colonial contribution was a comparatively recent one with the Colonies. The matter had really never been brought before them as a definite and concrete demand for a contribution towards the expenses of the Navy. There had been a certain amount of vague talk with reference to the subject. He ventured to say that any political party that seriously proposed that the Australian Colonies should be defended by a purely Australian navy would have very short shrift indeed. No party in the Colonies would for a moment suggest seriously that they should depart from the traditional custom of relying on the British Navy for defence. When the point was put before the Colonies, as it would be some day, he was quite certain that they would give every penny that could reasonably be demanded from them to pay their fair contribution to the cost of the Navy. The amount calculated in proportion to the population did not represent a very large sum. Another matter which had been repeatedly brought before the Secretary to the Admiralty was the utterly scandalous and inefficient ships which were sent to the north coast of Scotland to defend the fishing industry against foreign scoundrels and British depredators. The boats were only able to steam at eight knots an hour. Instead of sending for the purposes of the Fishery Board rubbish of that sort, which ought to have been broken up twenty or thirty years ago, the Admiralty should send vessels capable of performing the work they had to do.

The CHAIRMAN said the Scottish Fishery Board could not be brought in under this Vote.

MR. CATHCART WASON said he could not support the Amendment. The hon. Member who moved it must see that to refuse the sum the Government had asked would be to brand those who took that course as not having the desire to see the British Navy predominant. They ought to do everything they could in this House and out of it to make the Navy as powerful and great as possible.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said the increase in this Vote was inopportune. The hon. Gentleman in charge of the Estimates had given no explanation of the increase, although urgent appeals had been made from the Front Bench on the Opposition side of the House that the Government should state why the increase was proposed. While he was in favour of the British Navy being paramount on the sea, he thought that the Estimates of last year of £31,250,000 abundantly secured every end that the Admiralty should have in view in this matter. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean that we ought to try to substitute other means for the present system—probably by approaching all the other Powers with which we were competing—with the view to the reduction of expenditure on naval armaments. The right hon. Gentleman thought the time was opportune for this country approaching France, at least. He hoped some responsible Member of the Government would take that matter into consideration. In this debate no notice had been taken of the German Emperor's communication to the German Parliament with regard to the Navy Estimates. This statement was sent to the German Embassy, and published here for the information of the people of this country. That appeared to him to be an intimation on the part of the German Emperor that any approach made on the part of our Government with regard to this matter would be well received. He believed Government had no idea of the extraordinary feeling which had been created in the country by this immense increase in the Estimates. People who did not hesitate to support the Government during the late war blamed them now because they would not take any steps towards economy.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) appealed to the Committee to assent to this Vote. There was only a limited time in which the financial business of the year could be transacted—it must be finished before Thursday the 31st of March—and he did not see how the Government could arrange the business for the convenience of the House if this Vote was not now granted. He had endeavoured so to frame the Rules as to safeguard the rights of private Members, but the House must second his efforts to carry out these arrangements.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) said he had always supported the Admiralty in the view that this country should have the finest fleet in the world. What he complained of was the kind of gunboats sent to the North of Scotland to guard our fishing interests and to look after the trawlers which were ruining the fishing industry around our coasts. He hoped the Admiralty would provide boats for that work which were able to steam at fifteen or sixteen knots an hour.

MR. KEARLEY said the Prime Minister had appealed to the Committee to let him have this Vote. He would be the last man to stand in the right hon. Gentleman's way. The right hon. Gentleman had appealed to the Committee on the score of the exigencies of the financial year. Of course, that was a matter of which the right hon. Gentleman had the arrangement, and if he had not provided himself with plenty of time, he scarcely thought the right hon. Gentleman was justified in coming to the Committee and appealing on these grounds. The right hon. Gentleman had said something about their duty, but their duty was to discuss the Estimates. However, he was not going to resist the appeal of the right hon. Gentleman just then, but he gave notice that he and his friends would take the fullest possible care during the rest of the session to discuss the Votes. He wished to ask the First Lord of the Treasury a question. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that the new Victualling Order in the Navy came into force this year. During the previous two years they had been denied the opportunity of discussing the Victualling Vote, and he asked an assurance from the First Lord of the Treasury that, provided he got the present Vote, he would give an undertaking to allow full opportunity for discussing the new Victualling arrangements for the Navy on Vote 2.

Mr. BALFOUR said that as regarded the question put by the hon. Gentleman, he would consult the Secretary to the Admiralty and the wishes of the Committee as to the allocation of the time, which, of course, must be given to the Navy Estimates for next year before the end of the session. He believed it would be possible to arrange that the morning sitting of Monday next should be devoted to the report of the Navy Votes, assuming that the report of the Army Votes finished to-morrow. That would leave the evening sittting of Monday next for the report of the Vote on Account.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 27; Noes, 252. (Division List No. 35.)

AYES.

Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Craig, Robert Hunter (*Lanark*
Cremer, William Randal
Delany, William
Harrington, Timothy
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hope, John Deans (*Fife, West*)
Levy, Maurice
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benj.
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Patrick (*Kilkenny*)
O'Connor, Jas. (*Wicklow, W.*)
O'Kelly, J. (*Roscommon, N.*)
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Roberts, John Bryn (*Eifion*)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smith, Samuel (*Flint*)
Thomas, David A. (*Merthyr*)
White, George (*Norfolk*)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, H. J. (*York, W. R.*)

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Labouchere and Mr. Lough.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)
Allhusen, Aug. Henry Eden
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbt. Hy.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (*Walworth*)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (*Hornsey*
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (*Leeds*)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benj.
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Black, Alexander William
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (*Middx.*)
Brassey, Albert
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Butcher, John George
Caldwell, James
Campbell, Rt Hn J A (*Glasg.*)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (*N. Lancs.*)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (*Derbyshire*
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (*Greenwich*)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J A (*Worc*
Chapman, Edward
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colston, Chas. Edw H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Cox, Irwin Edwd. Bainbridge
Cranborne, Lord
Crombie, John William
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, M. Vaughan- (*Cardign*
Dewar, John A. (*Inverness-sh.*)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Jos. C.
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Douglas, Charles M. (*Lanark*)
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dunn, Sir William
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Edwards, Frank
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Emmott, Alfred
Faber, E. B. (*Hants, W.*)
Faber, George Denison (*York*)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (*Leith*
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (*Man'r*
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H (*City of Lond*
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (*St. Albans*
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Gordon, Maj Evans- (*Tr. H'ml's*
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (*Linc*
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E. W. (*Bury St. Ed.*
Gretton, John
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (*Berwick*
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.

Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld.G.(*Midx*
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick G.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur H. (*Hanley*)
Heath, James (*Staffords, N. W*
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, J. F. (*Sheff.*, *B'tside*)
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (*Midd.*, *Tott'ham*
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Jones, David B. (*Swansea*).
Jones, Wm. (*Carnarvonshire*)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(*Salop*
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (*Glasgow*
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, A. H. (*Hants, Fareham*)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leng, Sir John
Lockie, John
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (*Bristol, S.*
Lowther, C. (*Cumb. Eskdale*)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(*Portsmouth*
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (*Liverpool*)
M'Crae, George
M'Killop, Jas. (*Stirlingshire*)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Markham, Arthur Basil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,W.J.H.(*Dumfriessh*
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mitchell, William
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
Montagu,Hon.J.Scott(*Hants.*)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt. Jasper (*Shropshire*)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(*Bute*
Murray,Col.Wyndham(*Bath*)
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. J. P. (*Galway, N.*
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Sir C. M. (*Durham*)
Palmer, Walter (*Salisbury*)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Partington, Oswald
Peel, Hn. Wm. R. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pirie, Duncan V.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Price, Robert John
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley,HonM.W.(*Stalybridge*)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (*Sheffield*)
Robertson, H. (*Hackney*)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon. L. Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Runciman, Walter
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Samuel, Herbt. L. (*Cleveland*)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Chas. Hilton (*Lincoln*)
Seely,MajJ.E.B.(*Isle of Wight*
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (*Romford*)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,H.C.(*North'mb Tyneside*
Smith, Jas. Parker (*Lanarks.*)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (*Chichester*)
Talbot,RtHonJ.G.(*Oxf'dUniv*
Taylor, Austin (*East Toxteth*)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomson, F. W. (*York, W. R.*)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. E. M.
Toulmin, George
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,ColSirC.EH(*Sheffi'ld*)
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Wason, E. (*Clackmannan*)
Wason, J. Cathcart (*Orkney*)
Webb, Col. William George
Weir, James Galloway
Welby, Lt.-Col. A.C. (*Taunton*
Wharton, Rt. Hon. J. Lloyd
Whiteley, G. (*York, W. R.*)
Whiteley,H.(*Ashton-un.-Lyne*
Whitley, J. H. (*Halifax*)
Williams, Colonel R. (*Dorset*)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson John (*Glasgow*)
Wilson, J. W. (*Worcestersh, N.*
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (*Yorks.*)
Wodehouse,RtHn.E.R.(*Bath*)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley,Rt. Hon C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, MajorW. H.
Yerburgh, Robt. Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

GAS LIGHT AND COKE COMPANY'S ACTS AMENDMENT BILL [BY ORDER].

*MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N. said this Bill, promoted by the London County Council, sought to alter the standard price charged for gas by the Gas Light and Coke Company. The London County Council had every right to oppose the Bill of the Gas Light and Coke Company, which was also before the House, but it was a very unusual thing to bring in a measure to revise a Company's prices; he was told it was unprecedented, and he felt it his duty to bring the matter before the House. He did not propose to divide the House against the Bill, because he understood that the promoters of both the Bills had come to an agreement, and he therefore advised that the two Bills should go before a Committee upstairs.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said the question of precedent might be as the Deputy Chairman of Committees had stated it, but those responsible for the introduction of the Gas Light and Coke Company Bill had no obection to the County Council's Amendments Bill going through on the understanding that both the Bills should go to the same Committee upstairs.

The Bill was read a second time, and committed.

GAS LIGHT AND COKE COMPANY BILL

[BY ORDER].

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (GENERAL POWERS) BILL [BY ORDER].

Read a second time, and committed.

BRITISH AND COLONIAL TRADE.

MR. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) said he wished, in moving the Resolution which stood in his name, to call attention to some special dangers affecting British trade at the present time. Those dangers had all a family likeness, and were all derived from the policy of Protection which had so long been prevalent in foreign countries. This country had for the past fifty years consistently followed a policy of Free Trade, and the experience of those years had been partially disappointing and partially reassuring. It had been a disappointment that the anticipations of the supporters of Free Trade, that the example of England would speedily lead to universal adoption of a Free Trade policy, had been disappointed. For fifty years we had preached this gospel, and he did not know that we had made a single permanent convert. We had piped to them, but they had not danced. We had mourned with them, but they had not lamented. Foreign nations had failed to respond to our cordial invitations or solemn remonstrances. That was the unsatisfactory side of Free Trade. But when they turned to the effect of Free Trade upon the commercial interests of the country they found altogether a different result. They had every reason to believe that England had prospered greatly under the Free Trade policy of the last fifty years. Our trade had nearly trebled in amount during that period, imports and exports increasing from £308,000,000 to £878,000,000. The fact that Free Trade had shown such marvellous vitality and elasticity in combating the protective system had shown to the nations which adopted Protection the inadequate nature of the means at their disposal for spreading their trade, and consequently there had been within comparatively recent years a modification in the protective policy of foreign countries. There was a time when the policy was simply defensive, and when foreign nations were content with a tariff meant to be prohibitive, but now they had changed their tactics and adopted an aggressive Protection. They had so organised their commercial system, with the support of their respective Governments, that they had been able to attack the trade of other countries in their own, and also in neutral, markets. They had now to face the foreign bounty system, treaties of reciprocity between nations intending to displace the trade of other nations, and concessions of an exclusive character which prevented anyone but the subjects of that State engaging in a particular trade and in a particular area. Whilst a pacific protective policy might be met by a pacific Free Trade policy, an aggressive protective policy must be met by an active Free Trade policy. Free Trade required a certain sphere for its operation, and if that sphere were circumscribed there came a time when Free Trade ceased to be Free Trade. Therefore it was necessary that Great Britain, while adhering to her Free Trade policy, should meet that aggressive protection by some counteracting measures, and he submitted that the Free Trade policy properly included action necessary to prevent measures restrictive of Free Trade.

Our recognition of that principle had led us in recent times to adopt the policy of the "open door," and of counteracting foreign bounties by a convention. It was not only sugar bounties which attacked British industries. We had bounties in regard to shipping which were equally injurious. In the interesting Report of the Shipping Subsidies Committee they found a list of the subsidies given to their shipping by foreign countries. The United Kingdom, which had over one-half of the tonnage of the world, gave subsidies amounting to £834,312; Germany, with about one-tenth of the world's tonnage, gave £417,525, and in addition preferential railway rates and exemption from Custom duties; France, with only 5 per cent., gave £1,787,231; Russia, with 2 per cent., gave £364,756; Austro-Hungary, with only 1 per cent., gave £399,743; and Japan, with 1½ per cent., gave £745,607. Those figures would enable the House to realise how heavily British shipping was handicapped. It was impossible to refer to all the branches of the shipping trade affected by those subsidies, but some had been diverted to foreign countries altogether. One instance would show the prejudicial effect of those bounties upon our sailing-ship trade. By the French law of 1893, which gave a subsidy of 1s. 4½d. per gross ton for every thousand miles traversed, a vessel in her first year received on the voyage to and from San Francisco £4,142, which was so much to the good provided by her Government, and was almost sufficient to pay the working expenses. The result was that the French vessel, with the assistance of the bounty, was able to undercut her British competitor, and made a handsome dividend, whilst the English vessel often had to sail away from port in ballast. If sailing ships had a fair field and no favour they would pay their way, and it must be remembered that they provided the very best nursery for the training of British seamen. In the five years from 1895 to 1900, whilst the tonnage of British sailing ships had decreased by 25 per cent., that of France had increased by 32 per cent., which was due to the operation of the bounty system. Italy and Germany had also increased. If nothing was done, and those conditions continued, there was no doubt in the course of a few years our sailing ships for long voyages would disappear completely. The Subsidies Committee had found no remedy for those questions. He was not there to advocate the policy of giving bounties to shipping, but he did think that they should do something to penalise those vessels which competed with ours on such very unfair conditions. There ought to be an extra duty imposed upon the bounty-fed vessels visiting our ports which would to some extent counteract the effects of these bounties and restore equality of treatment to British ships.

Another way in which foreign countries were pursuing a very aggressive policy with regard to our shipping was by limiting their coastwise and colonial trade to their national vessels. That policy was adopted by Russia and applied to a voyage from the Black Sea to the Baltic and from Odessa to Vladivostok, by the United States, who applied it to a 15,000 miles voyage from New York to San Francisco, and by Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal, and many other countries. Was it fair that Great Britain should throw her trade open to all the world, and that foreign countries should limit their trade to their own ships? He thought there ought to be a certain amount of reciprocity in that matter, and he could not help thinking if Great Britain, with the largest coast line in the world, were to say unless foreign countries gave her vessels fair treatment her ports would be shut against those foreign vessels, they would very soon see a very different state of things. The Subsidies Committee recommended that course, and on the occasion of the conference of the Colonial Secretary with the Colonial Premiers last year the Colonies showed their willingness to concur with this country in that policy, and passed a resolution that it was desirable that the attention of the Governments of the Colonies and of the United Kingdom should be called to the present state of the navigation laws, and the advisability of restricting coastwise trade, including trade between the mother country and the Colonies and one colony and another to British vessels.

Having referred to the question of reciprocity treaties, mentioning in particular the effect of that which had been arranged between Cuba and the United States, he asked what steps the Government had taken in order to deal with the situation as to exclusive territorial concessions. He referred to what had taken place in the French Congo. Our traders were established there before the French acquired political rights there, but when they did obtain those rights the position of our traders was considerably changed. They had to submit to very onerous differential duties. They continued under most embarrassing conditions, and every means had been taken to expel them from the country. This conduct appeared to be entirely contrary to provisions of the Berlin Act. Trade did not enjoy freedom. A complete monopoly had been established, and there did seem to be a case for the reassembling of the Powers which signed the Berlin Treaty.

While he thought it was desirable that there should be some more concerted and effective action to endeavour to remove these hindrances to British trade, he was not there to advocate a preferential system of trade between the United Kingdom and the Colonies. There were two considerations in regard to that. They had to remember that three-quarters of our trade was done with foreign countries and only one quarter with the Colonies, and, however much we might wish to increase our trade relations with the Colonies, yet we could not shut our eyes to the fact that our largest customers were to be found in foreign countries, and that whatever our opinions might be, we should do nothing which would alienate or endanger our trade with foreign countries; we ought to give careful and sympathetic consideration to the overtures of the Colonies in this respect, and he believed a closer political union, which he supposed most Members of the House desired to see established, could only find its really solid basis upon a common interest between the United Kingdom and its Colonies. He was not prepared to advocate a departure from our Free Trade system, but he thought that anything that could be done consistently with that, to draw the Colonies closer to ourselves would be in every respect a step in the right direction, and he looked forward to, at some distant time perhaps, the establishment of what the Government had expressed as their goal in this matter—Free Trade within the Empire. In this Free Trade within the Empire he believed we should find the best solution of some of our difficulties. There might be difficulties in the way, but he thought the time had arrived when they might ask the Government to pay special attention to these attacks which were being made upon British trade, and to urge that some joint action should be undertaken between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Colonial Governments in order to safeguard the common interests of the Empire. He believed that as our Colonies so nobly fought with our soldiers on the battlefield in defence of Imperial interests, so they would be willing to stand side by side with us in the more peaceful object of safeguarding the trade of the Empire.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor) seconded the Motion. For himself, he said he did not believe that shipping subsidies were a paramount remedy, though under certain conditions, when given for value received, they were very valuable adjuncts to skill and industry. Neither was he an advocate of Fair Trade with Protection; but he did not desire to see our policy of Free Trade used by foreign countries to injure our commerce and further their own policy of Protection. It was no use when our trade was being seriously attacked simply to stand by. Among the recent developments of foreign fiscal and commercial policy which threatened British trade were the introduction of through preferential rates, and the reservation of the coasting trade. The freight from port to port in German and English steamers was the same, but when goods were taken from a place inland to a place inland, from Berlin, for instance, to Johannesburg, the actual rate per mile was considerably less on the German lines than on the English, owing to the through preferential rates. The result of the action of this commercial and fiscal policy of foreign nations had been that orders were placed with foreign manufacturers in preference to British manufacturers, owing to the cheaper through rates of freight. Mr. Spicer, a well-known wholesale stationer, in his evidence before the Steamship Subsidies Committee, as representing the London Chamber of Commerce, had stated that on several occasions his firm had had paper stock to procure for its Australian houses; that the rates of freight from New York to Melbourne and Sydney in 1899 to 1901 were from 17s. 6d. to 20s. and 25s. a ton, and from London to Melbourne and Sydney at the same time they were 42s. 6d., and that consequently those goods had to be placed with American manufacturers. It could not be said, therefore, that no harm had been incurred by British trade, in consequence of the action of foreigners in their commercial and fiscal policies.

There were many remedies to counteract the harm which was incurred by British trade in consequence of the action of foreign Governments in respect of their fiscal and commercial policy which might be suggested. In the first place, he would suggest the abolition of light dues; and, in the next place, he believed that a direct British line to East Africa would be of value both for Imperial and trade purposes. But these remedies involved money; and this year, at all events, he could not expect His Majesty's Government to spend money with that liberality that he should desire in regard to these matters. Much could be done, however, without any expenditure; and he hoped the Board of Trade would be disposed to show more energy than it had sometimes done in directions which he would indicate.

A small and easy, but an important, matter was the institution of a small permanent committee, with representatives of shipping and commerce, who could watch foreign competition and consider from time to time how it might best be met. This would be in the nature of a council of commercial defence. There was also the question of the Amendment of the Board of Trade regulations and of their application, as far as possible, equally to foreign ships as to British ships, because it was notorious that in recent times British ships which could not be made to pay owing to the Board of Trade regulations had been sold to foreigners, and had been run by foreigners with an increased carrying capacity and a smaller crew and less wages. He would more especially direct the attention of the Board of Trade to the need for a thorough revision of our load line regulations. The House must be aware of what Germany had been doing in that respect. She had been very busy for the last two or three years in a minute investigation of the load line question, and more particularly of our Board of Trade rules. Thousands of reports on various ships had been collected by a semi-official body called the German Association of Maritime Classes. The investigation was not yet completed, but, so far as it had gone, it was thought that the British load line regulations ould not be accepted for German ships indiscriminately, as some types of vessels could be loaded more deeply than was allowed by British rules, and others not so deeply. This in itself was amply sufficient to justify him in urging the Board of Trade to take this matter into consideration, and he was sure that Parliament would not be behindhand in sanctioning any alteration of the rules based upon good sense and modern needs.

The third remedy, which did not require an expenditure of public money, was connected with the question of through preferential rates. What was the Board of Trade policy in regard to that? It was clear that through preferential rates did not infringe any doctrine of Free Trade, because they were admitted for inland purposes, and higher rates per ton per mile were charged from London to Grantham than from London to Hull. The inequality was recognised by the Railway Rates and Charges Acts, 1892, and there was no doubt that railways in Great Britain could give preferential rates to goods carried in great bulk or run long distances. Why then could they not extend the principle beyond the seas? there could be no objection to giving through preferential rates for goods from London to South Africa. It was a matter for the consideration of the House. He did not want to make any exaggerated or extravagant demand, but if it was to the national advantage to establish low through preferential rates, thereby encouraging British trade, the matter was one worthy the consideration of the Board of Trade. As regarded ocean and the operation of preferential transit, through rates he would not deal with that at any length, as they would probably have ample opportunity of discussing it when the Cunard agreement came before the House; but he imagined there would be no real objection to regulating ocean freights with through rates so as to bring them within a maximum limit, as was already done with regard to passenger fares on railways. He did not want to adopt a minatory attitude, but he believed that the steamship and railway companies would really be gainers by cheap through rates, as increased traffic would be attracted. He had heard it suggested that the initiative ought to come from the railway companies; but the state of the law was very doubtful. There was a section (27, sub-Section 2) in the Railway and Canal Act of 1888 dealing with undue preference, and though in the case of the Mansion House Association *v* the London and South Western Railway, decided in 1895, a decision was come to not prohibiting all inequalities of rates, yet the Judge (Mr. Justice Collins) stated that the effect of the proviso in the sub-Section was that goods which had already traversed long distances before reaching the United Kingdom were not entitled to lower rates in consequence. He did not think railway companies were likely to oppose a change, if required, in favour of through preferential rates. Manufactories had been removed from the Midland counties to the sea-board in order to avoid the high railway rates, and the companies would not have been such fools as to allow that had it not been for the law of undue preference; for when a factory was removed the place where it had been was reduced to a mere village, and was absolutely of no advantage to the company. The Board of Trade should make up its mind whether this policy of through preferential rates would not be of Imperial advantage, and, in the event of its being felt that it would be, it ought to be satisfied that the law created no hindrance.

The fourth remedy, which did not require money, and which could therefore be undertaken by the Government, was the reciprocal reservation of the British coasting trade, a reservation to meet the cases of such nations as chose to reserve their coasting trade against us. That seemed to him to be a very laudable policy. It had been urged by a high financial authority, Sir Robert Giffen; it was the opinion of the hon. Member for Great Yarmouth; and it was emphatically the opinion of very many of our Colonies. The coast line of the British Empire was the greatest of any country in the world, and he did not think they would be making any mistake if they were to advocate a policy which would ensure to us reciprocal advantages against those countries which reserved their coasting trade against us. He had been told that one of the objections to such a policy was that the consumers would suffer. He did not think they would, for the competition among the British steamship companies would be too great. That argument prompted the proposal which he submitted in his draft report to the Steamship Subsidies Committee for a qualified reservation of the British Imperial coasting trade, embracing a somewhat different proposal to the one actually decided upon. He did not mean to say he disagreed with the decision of the Committee, but he submitted that his alternative proposal did not infringe any doctrine of Free Trade in any respect, while it would materially safeguard us against the system of foreign governments in reserving their coasting trade to themselves. His proposal had been to exact a fine or licence from foreign ships engaging in British coasting trade, computed on the basis of any subsidy for trade, navigation, or construction from which they benefit. Foreign vessels trading to British ports no doubt only represented 9 or 10 per cent. of the total number, but this was not a trifle; he did no fear reprisals; and foreign nations which reserved their coasting trade to themselves could not complain if we chose to follow their example, if only in a qualified way, and if we decided to open our coasting trade only to those who opened theirs to our ships.

Summarising his remarks, he would repeat that the remedies which required money were the abolition of the light dues, and a direct Imperial line to East Africa; while those which did not require money and which, therefore, the Government could very well undertake, were a small permanent Committee of the Admiralty, Post Office, Colonial Office, and Board of Trade, together with representatives of shipping and commerce, which would constitute a commercial Council of Defence like the National Committee of Defence. We also needed a thorough revision of our load line regulations, the institution of through preferential rates, and a careful consideration or modification of the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, and, lastly, the reciprocal reservation of our coasting trade. He ventured to say that if some or all of these remedies were decided upon by the Government, the President of the Board of Trade would earn the gratitude of the commercial community, and his reign of office would be looked back upon by the nation as one of lasting value.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That recent developments of fiscal and commercial policy in foreign countries, leading to the exclusion of British trade from areas in which it has previously been established, call for the serious consideration of His Majesty's Government, in concert with the Colonial Governments, where necessary, in order to safeguard the trade of the Empire."—(*Mr. Charles McArthur.*)

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) said they had listened to some very interesting and moderate speeches, which however had raised many questions which did not appear on the face of the Resolution before the House, although they might be cognate to the trade of the country. The Resolution which the House was asked to pass dealt with four subjects—foreign shipping bounties, reciprocity treaties, exclusive territorial concessions, especially in the Congo district, and the need for closer commercial union between the mother country and her Colonies. These subjects affected three Departments of the Government—the Board of Trade, the Foreign Office, and the Colonial Office, while the question of a closer commercial union with the Colonies might concern also the Chancellor of the Exchequer. This was a huge omnibus Resolution dealing with many subjects, any one of which contained ample material for a night's debate. It was strangely ambiguous in its terms, and might be supported by free traders and opponents of Free Trade. He wished it had been more contracted in its scope and more specific in the remedies proposed. With the part dealing with exclusive territorial concessions he quite agreed. It was quite true that when the Berlin Treaty was framed we were promised in the Congo basin Free Trade and no monopoly, and when the Congo Free State was handed over it was promised that the moral and material regeneration of the natives of the State should be the chief aim of the Administration. Since then, however, we had learnt that all the products of the forest outside the villages and settlements were the property of the State, and the exploiting of these huge territories and forests by monopolist companies, which earned enormous dividends, and shared the profits with the State, had been the result; of this trade very little came to us—it nearly all went to Belgium. That was a matter in regard to which we had the utmost reason to complain, and when, in addition to that, we knew that the effect of this monopoly system had been such as to necessitate, almost, some of the horrible cruelties which could not be denied, and which were the direct result of that monopolist system with its brutal cannibal soldiery, he thought the Government might well be asked to see whether something could not be done to call together the Powers which were responsible for the Berlin Act, and ascertain if some new and better system could not be put in force.

He did not propose to deal at any length with the question of the shipping bounties, but he would ask

What could we do in that matter? Some countries still kept on something like the old Navigation Laws, and neither the mover nor the seconder of the Resolution recommended that we in our turn should give bounties for shipping in this country to a greater extent than we were doing at the present time. The mover certainly did recommend that we should penalise the bounty-fed shipping of other countries, and on that suggestion he would not pronounce any opinion at the moment, but he did not think it would be worth while to do anything—as they might easily do—to raise serious foreign complications in regard to this matter. As to reciprocity treaties what could we do to prevent them? The United States might have made certain declarations with regard to Cuban trade, but our own Prime Minister just before the recent war stated, no doubt with perfect sincerity, that we wanted no gold-fields and no territory. It was impossible on all occasions to keep nations to declarations of that kind, and, for his own part, while he regretted this new reciprocity treaty, he was unable to see how we could help it.

The question of closer commercial union with the colonies was a very large one. Both in 1897 and last year conferences attended by the Colonial Premiers and the Colonial Secretary were held, and it was found that no such scheme could be carried at present. The Government were known to be favourable to any such scheme, if practicable and in accordance with the principles on which our trade had been and, in his opinion, must be conducted; why, therefore, should they flog the willing horse? The Resolution referred to—

> "Recent developments of fiscal and commercial policy in foreign countries, leading to the exclusion of British trade from areas in which it has previously been established."

but neither the mover nor the seconder had pointed to any areas from which our trade had been excluded. But even if it had been excluded here and there, or had been made smaller than it otherwise would have been, our trade with the British Empire remained practically at the figure at which it had stood for the last forty or fifty years. Their British Empire had increased, and whereas other countries had put on tariffs against our trade, we had received reasonable fair-play from our own territories and possessions, and yet the proportion of our trade with the British Empire was no bigger than it was fifty, forty, or twenty years ago. Our proportion of trade with the British Empire in 1855 – 1859 was 27 per cent.; in 1897–1902 it was only 26 per cent. Our imports from the British Empire during that period varied from 21 per cent. to 22 per cent., and our exports from 33 per cent. to 35 per cent. In the last two years there had been a slight increase in the exports, and he hoped the trade would increase in the future. The conclusion of the Resolution was that these facts—

> "Call for the serious consideration of His Majesty's Government, in concert with the Colonial Governments, where necessary, in order to safeguard the trade of the Empire."

There were many problems connected with trade requiring the constant and serious attention of the Government. He did not think the tariffs of foreign countries could be eternally raised without considerably damaging our own trade, but what was the remedy? If the Colonies gave us a preference, as Canada had done, that would be all to the good. If they were coming into a great scheme of Imperial federation, and were going to pay their fair share of the cost of Imperial defence, it might be necessary seriously to consider what we on our part could do in return. But if our expenditure was to go on increasing by leaps and bounds, that in itself would prove the greatest barrier possible to any scheme of Imperial federation, because it would frighten the Colonies from taking part in the huge burdens to which we were committed. Any scheme of taxing ourselves by giving the Colonies preferential treatment would be sheer madness at the present time, as our imports from foreign countries were still more than three-fourths of the whole of our imports, while of cotton alone only 1½ per cent. came from the Empire, the remaining 98½ per cent. coming from foreign countries. Cotton was very scarce and dear, and it would be absolute folly to interfere with that huge trade by making trade with foreign countries more difficult.

There was one thing, however, he would like to see, and that was the removal, as regarded India, of the 5 per cent. import duty on goods other than cotton, the 3½ per cent. on cotton goods, and the excise duties; that would certainly facilitate trade with India. More attention might with advantage be given to exploiting our Colonies in a peaceful way There was a movement on foot to see what could be done to encourage the growing of cotton within the Empire. A large fund had been guaranteed, the Colonial Office were doing what they could to help the movement, and the Colonial Governors were sympathetic. There were many territories in which cotton might be grown, and he hoped that before many years were over something would be done in that direction. That, however, was a question of the future. With regard to the present, a large trade in the importation of bananas from Jamaica had been organised, and it was doing much to restore the prosperity of Jamaica, which had been so sadly damaged by the fall in the price of sugar. Trinidad, too, was compensating itself for the losses sustained from the sugar trade by growing cocoa. There were many matters of this kind in regard to which something might be done to improve trade within the Empire. They were matters of detail, but they required earnest and careful consideration. He was certain it was by such methods rather than by any fundamental changes, such as would doubtless be proposed before the debate concluded, that trade within the Empire might be improved. The Resolution would have very little effect if carried; it embraced far too many subjects to be voted upon at the present time. He hoped, therefore, it would not be pressed to a division.

SIR ROBERT ROPNER (Stockton), in supporting the Resolution, said that the Subsidies Committee, of which he was a member, after two years of careful consideration, came to the conclusion that indiscriminate subsidies to shipping, for no value rendered, were entirely unjustifiable.

Notice taken that forty Members were not present; House counted, and forty Members not being present:—

The House was adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Eleven of the Clock till to-morrow.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 18th March, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Lancashire and Yorkshire and London and North-Western Railways (Steam Vessels) Bill; North-Eastern Railway Bill, read a second time and committed.

Seaforth and Sefton Junction Railway Bill (by Order), read a second time, and committed.

THAMES RIVER STEAMBOAT SERVICE BILL.

"To provide for the acquisition and construction of piers and landing places on the River Thames, in the administrative county of London by the London County Council, and to make provision for a service of vessels for passengers and parcels; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

WEST SUSSEX WATER BILL.

Order for Second Reading to-morrow read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

NEATH, PONTARDAWE, AND BRYNAMAN RAILWAY BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Report of the Board of Trade on the Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 2).

The Deputy Chairman informed the House, That the Committee on Group 2 of Railway Bills, not being appointed to meet until Tuesday next, the parties promoting the Coventry and Arley Railway Bill, which was set down for consideration upon the first day of the meeting of the Committee, had appeared before him and proved that the evidence of Arthur Henry Stokes, of Greenhill, Derby, one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines, was essential to their case, and that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House.

Ordered, That Arthur Henry Stokes do attend the Committee on Group 2 of Railway Bills on Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP B).

The Deputy Chairman informed the House that the Committee on Group B of Private Bills not being appointed to meet until Tuesday next, the parties promoting the Cork Harbour Bill which was set down for the first day of the meeting of the Committee had appeared before him and proved that the evidence of Joseph Pike, chairman of the Cork Steamship Company, Cork, was essential to their case, and that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House.

Ordered, That Joseph Pike do attend the Committee on Group B of Private Bills on Tuesday next at Twelve of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE BILL.

Petition from Lewes, against, to lie upon the Table.

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.

Petitions in favour: from London (two); Bury; Leeds; Blackburn; Sheffield; and Cheltenham; to lie upon the Table.

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Falkirk Oathlaw; Dornoch; and Alves; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petitions against: from Brentford; Stoke-upon-Trent; Devonport; Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Burton-upon-Trent Dudley; Little Hulton; Worsborough; Weetslade; and, Woking; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petition from Glossop, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

Petition from Coatbridge, against establishment; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Holloway; and Sheffield; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SHANGHAI (CONSULAR JURISDICTION).

Return [presented 17th March] to be printed. [No. 81.]

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Copy presented, of licence granted to James Johnstone, a convict under detention in Wormwood Scrubbs Prison, permitting him to leave the prison on condition of his proceeding to the Middlesex Hospital, there to be examined, and, if necessary, to undergo an operation, and there remaining in the custody of a prison officer, and afterwards returning, when fit to do so, to Wormwood Scrubbs Prison [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (CODE 1903).

Copy presented, of Provisional Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools and Training Colleges, with Schedules, by the Board of Education [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Reports from University Colleges, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.

PUBLIC RECORDS (ADMIRALTY).

Copy of Tenth Schedule containing a list and particulars of classes of documents which have been removed from the office of the Commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and deposited in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein [by Act].

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Damage to Breakwater at Port of Ness, Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that the breakwater at Port of Ness, Island of Lewis, has been damaged by the storm of the 28th February last; and will he state what action it is proposed to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) Yes, Sir. A letter has been received to the effect that the breakwater was damaged about the time named, but the information given is very vague and is not sufficient to enable any decision to be come to. The Secretary for Scotland has taken steps to get further information.

Port Ness Harbour.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Lord Advocate whether he is now prepared to make public the report of Mr. William Shield in regard to the condition of the harbour at Port Ness, Island of Lewis.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) If the hon. Member will move for the Correspondence, it will be presented in the usual form.

Steamer Service between Mallaig, Lochinver, etc.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland has received a petition from the inhabitants of the western mainland of Ross and Cromarty and Sutherland, urging the establishment of a steamer service between Mallaig, Lochinver, and intermediate ports; and whether, in view of the advantage of the proposed steamer to postal service and fishing industry in the congested area, he will consider the expediency of arranging for the Congested Districts Board to grant an annual subsidy in aid of the service.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The petition in question has been received by the Secretary for Scotland and answered by him. No subsidies are now granted to steamship companies trading with the Western Highlands; the only payment made from public funds to such companies is as mail carriers in return for services rendered to the Postmaster-General.

Vaccination in Scotland—Animal Lymph.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the insufficient supply of animal lymph for vaccination purposes in Scotland, will he consider the advisability of establishing in Scotland an animal vaccine station and laboratory for the preparation of glycerinated calf lymph similar to the establishment under the control of the Local Government Board, London.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I cannot assent to the view that the supply of animal lymph for vaccination purposes in Scotland has been found to be insufficient. But a proposal to establish in Scotland a station for the preparation of glycerinated calf lymph has been made to the Secretary for Scotland, and will be considered.

Customs Watchers—Annual Increments.

Captain NORTON (Newington, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if his attention has been directed to the order stating that one-fourth of the Customs watchers shall proceed by annual increments of 1s. to 24s. a week; and will he explain why all the Customs watchers are not to be allowed to have the benefit of this increment.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) The value of the services of a watcher on first employment was estimated at 21s. per week, but as the value might be expected in many cases to increase with his experience, the Treasury accordingly, in 1900, authorised the grant to a limited number of watchers of an increase of pay, but to grant this increase to all the officers indiscriminately would be inconsistent with the principle on which the concession was granted.

Liberation of Slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba.

Mr. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, with a view to facilitate the liberation of the remaining slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to recommend the Sultan's Government to abolish at an early date the regulations, which have now been some years in operation, as to the payment of compensation for slaves in future liberated within the Sultan's territories.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) His Majesty's Government are unaware that there exists any difficulty whatever in the liberation of the remaining slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba. Emancipation lies in their own hands, and no action seems required to achieve the object suggested by the hon. Member.

Publicans' Licences—Appeals.

Sir THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will consider the advisability of issuing directions to the clerks to licensing justices to advise the justices not to appear as respondents at quarter sessions in appeals against the refusals of licences where renewals have been withheld on grounds other than those connected with the conduct of the licenceholders, in order that the costs of the respondents in such cases should not fall upon the rates

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*) I have no authority whatever to issue any such directions.

Shipbuilding at Devonport.

Mr. LOCKIE (Devonport): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will arrange that one of the new battleships provided for in the Navy Estimates shall be built at Devonport.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) It is not proposed to lay down one of the new battleships at Devonport, as both Devonport and Keyham will be fully occupied during the coming year with the work of construction and repair already allotted to them.

Income Tax—Suggested Alteration in Dates of Payment.

Mr. LOCKIE: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will consider the advisability of making the Income Tax payable in quarterly instalments instead of annually.

(*Answered by Mr. Ritchie.*) The system which the hon. Member suggests was established by law, and to some extent carried out in practice in this country, previous to the year 1869, when it was abandoned for the present arrangement. The practical difficulties in working the system which led to its abandonment are, there is reason to believe, greater now than they were then, and make any recurrence to it inadvisable.

Ireland—Ancient Monument at Greenan, Londonderry.

Mr. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of Public Works have as yet ascertained if the proprietor of Greenan, near Londonderry, is prepared to execute a deed vesting this ancient monument in them as promised by him on the 17th November last.†

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Correspondence on the subject is still proceeding between the proprietor and the Commissioners.

Irish Fisheries—Close Seasons.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that injury is occasioned to the fishing industry in county Down by Scotch and English fishing fleets during the close season of their own coasts, resulting in the destruction of fish shoals on the Down coast and the depreciation of the quality of the herrings; and whether, seeing that the fishermen are unable on this account to compete in the English markets with the fully-developed herring caught elsewhere, he will consider the desirability of making the period from January to June a close season between Clougher Head and Belfast Lough.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) No representations appear to have been made to the Department of Agriculture in this matter. If made they will receive every consideration.

Labourers' Cottages in Ireland.

Mr. FFRENCH (Wexford, S): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to a resolution recently passed by the Wexford District Council calling attention to the fact that £59,000 was granted in 1891 to encourage the building of labourers' cottages, and pointing out that a large residue remains, as twelve counties did not avail themselves of the grant; and whether he will consider the advisability of dividing the residue between the counties that have built cottages, giving special consideration to counties that had worked the Labourers Act previous to 1891.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The unexpended balance of the grant in aid of labourers' cottages provided by section 5 of the 54 and 55 Vict., cap. 48, amounted to £58,942 on the 31st March, 1902. The share of each county in this fund is prescribed by statutory regulations made by the Lord Lieutenant, and could not be diverted in the manner suggested except by an amendment of the law.

Labourers Act in Galway—Unexpended Balances.

Colonel NOLAN (Galway, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant what is the amount of the unexpended balance under the Labourers Acts for the county of Galway.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The share of the county Galway in the unexpended balance of the grant in aid of labourers' cottages amounted to £5,319 1s. 1d. on the 31st March, 1902.

Drill Hall at Durham.

Mr. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can say what proportion of the cost of erecting the drill hall situated in the city of Durham was contributed from Government funds; and whether it is in harmony with the conditions of such grant for the building to be rented for concerts and other kinds of amusements.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxiv., 1113.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) No proportion of the cost was contributed from Government funds; the corps has, however, been granted a loan under the Military Lands Acts. There is no objection whatever to the use of a drill hall in the manner alluded to when it is not required for military purposes; moreover, the profits derived from such uses are often utilised to meet the sinking fund charges.

Army Recruiting—Rejections on Account of Bad Teeth.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for War, in view of a statement contained in the recently issued Report of the Inspector-General of Recruiting to the effect that in the reports from manufacturing districts stress is laid upon the number of men rejected for bad teeth, will he state the percentage of men who were rejected for this cause during the year under review.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The number of men rejected for bad teeth in 1902 was 4,558, and the ratio per 1,000 inspected was 52·03. This number is nearly double the figures for 1901.

Boat Slips on Lough Swilly.

MR. O'DOHERTY: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, having regard to the importance of Lough Swilly as a fortified harbour of refuge, the Government propose to improve the piers or boat slips along the lough in order to give facilities for communication between the various forts lately erected thereon.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Certain facilities already exist for landing at the various forts on Lough Swilly, and it is proposed to improve these as funds become available. Further, the question of the improvement of the pier at Buncrana is under consideration.

Volunteers—Recruiting Statistics.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will give the number of recruits obtained for the Volunteers from 1st November last year to the end of February.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The number of recruits obtained between the 1st October, 1902 and 1st January, 1903 was 9,153. The figures asked for cannot be given as the returns are only rendered quarterly.

Meat Contracts—Substitution of Foreign for Home-grown Meat.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): To ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been drawn to cases in which frozen and chilled meat, or meat from animals killed at Deptford, the wharves, or other places within ten days after arrival from abroad, has been substituted for British and Irish grown meat stipulated for in the contracts; and, if so, will he say what action he proposes taking, and give the wording of that portion of the contract that pertains thereto.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) No actual proved cases of this nature have been brought to the notice of the War Office. The wording of the contract is as follows:—"The beef shall be home-bred ox, not under two nor more than eight years old, or home-bred heifer and cow, not under two nor more than four years old; the mutton wether or ewe. Carcases of sheep weighing less than 50 lbs will not be received. Frozen mutton when supplied shall be from British Colonies exclusively."

Army Officers Compulsorily Retired.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to the Parliamentary Return of twenty-one officers of the Regular Army compulsorily retired or dismissed the Service during 1900 to 1902, can he state the number dismissed by sentence of Court-martial, and also the number who have been brought to resign under the pressure that if they did not voluntarily send in their papers their services would be dispensed with; and the number of those who have asked for inquiry or Court-martial and have been refused; what are the numbers of officers placed on half-pay; and can he also give, where applicable, same details for Militia and Volunteers.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The statistics are as follows:—Regular forces—Officers dismissed by sentence of Court-martial, 9; officers who resigned under pressure, 81; officers who asked for inquiry or Court martial and were refused, 2; officers placed on half-pay, 9. Militia and Volunteers—Officers removed, or whose services have been dispensed with, Militia, 26, Volunteers, 15; officers dismissed by sentence of Court-martial, Militia, 6, Volunteers, 2; officers who resigned under pressure, Militia, 38, Volunteers, 33; officers who applied for Court-martial and were refused, Militia, 0, Volunteers 1; Reserve of officers—Dismissed by sentence of Court-martial, Militia, 0, Volunteers, 2.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Compulsorily Retired Officers.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state how many of each rank of the officers on half-pay, eligible for employment, have been compulsorily placed on half-pay; for how long each of these officers has been on that list; and how many it is the intention of the Government not to employ again.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The number of officers on half-pay, eligible for employment, who have been compulsorily placed on half-pay amounts to eleven lieutenant-colonels and colonels. The periods during which they have been on that list lie between December 1896 and February of this year. I am not prepared to give any answer to the last part of the Question.

Officers of the Auxiliary Forces.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will say how many Militia, Yeomanry and Volunteer officers, respectively, hold the "Q" Certificate; and how many Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteer officers respectively hold the "T" Certificate.

MR. BRODRICK: The figures are as follows:—"Q or q" Certificate—Militia, 16, Yeomanry 3, Volunteers, 112; "T or t" Certificate—Militia, 133, Yeomanry, 31, Volunteers, 1248.

Army Horses.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will cause the horses of Regular troops at home to be classified so that no horse is reckoned effective until five years old, fully trained, and practically sound for active service; and whether he will distinguish in Army Estimates between remount and effective horses, according to the Returns of the previous 1st January.

MR. BRODRICK: Under present classification no troop horse is considered fit for active service until it is six years old and fully trained. As regards the figures in the Estimates, I do not think any good purpose would be served by the additional tables involved.

Army Returns.

COLONEL WELBY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can see his way to classifying the privates of the Regular forces at home, so than no soldier shall be reckoned effective until he has been dismissed all recruit drills and courses, and is by age and physique qualified for active or foreign service; whether he will distinguish in Army Estimates between recruits and effectives, as shown by the Returns of the previous 1st January; and, if he cannot see his way to this classification, whether he will inquire the opinions of officers commanding units of Regulars at home, and defer final decision till those opinions have been considered.

MR. BRODRICK: I must point out to my hon. and gallant friend that in the first place the qualifications for active or Foreign Service vary according to the nature of the service or the climate; and in the second place the returns already furnished to the War Office give all particulars necessary for the detailing of drafts or forming of a true estimate of the state of units. When the increased rates of Service pay come into operation soldiers will be classified accordingly, but I do not think any distinctions can be drawn on the lines suggested.

COLONEL WELBY suggested that under the circumstances the right hon. Gentleman should obliterate the word "effective" from the Army Estimates.

Army Veterinary Officers.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state what the proposed improvements in the pay and prospects of the Army veterinary officers will be, and upon what date they will come into force, seeing that the Army Veterinary Department is below its authorised peace establishment.

MR. BRODRICK: The Committee which is considering these matters has not yet reported.

Army Remount Department.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the advisability of employing retired officers of the Army Veterinary Department as purchasing officers under the proposed rules for the reorganisation of the Army Remount Department, in view of the saving to the State that would be effected thereby.

MR. BRODRICK: A veterinary officer's responsibility is purely professional, and is limited to the soundness and age of the animals purchased. It is not considered advisable to employ him as a purchasing officer, who has to determine the fitness of horses in point of breeding, appearance, strength and action.

New Naval Base at St. Margaret's Hope.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state the extent and rental of the land proposed to be acquired for the new naval station at St. Margaret's Hope.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The extent and rental cannot be stated as negotiations are still in progress.

Alaska Boundary Tribunal.

MR. ROSE (Cambridgeshire, Newmarket): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Commissioners on the Alaska Boundary Tribunal have been officially nominated by his Majesty's Government and the government of the United States; and, if so, whether he is in a position to submit their names.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The President of the United States has appointed Mr. Elihu Raat, Secretary for War in the present administration, and Senators Lodge and Turner to be the American Members of the Commission. His Majesty's Government have, at the suggestion of the Dominion Government, decided to appoint as the British members the Lord Chief Justice of England, Sir Louis Aimable Jetté, retired Judge of the Superior Court of Province of Quebec, and Judge J. Douglas Armour, of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Education Ordinance at Pretoria.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been directed to an ordinance on education matters promulgated some days ago at Pretoria, in which a maximum of three hours weekly for instruction in the Dutch language, with a maximum of two hours' Biblical instruction given in Dutch, has been established; and whether he will take steps to secure that the number of hours allowed per week for instruction in the Dutch language may be increased.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: My attention has been directed to the ordinance to which the hon. Member refers. It provides for five hours instruction per week in Dutch when the parents desire it. The time allotted is the same as in the schools of Cape Colony, and I have received no complaints respecting it, and see no reason for any alteration.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Was not heavy pressure brought to bear on you in the matter by the Rev. Mr. Bosman in Pretoria?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Gentleman has been entirely misinformed. The only communication I have had from or with Mr. Bosman was a private interview. As the hon. Member refers to it, I may say that Mr. Bosman expressed himself perfectly satisfied with the arrangement.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: But the ordinance was promulgated after the interview.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: That is irrelevant to the point. The Rev. Mr. Bosman understood that five hours per week would be given for Dutch and religious instruction, and he expressed himself, personally, entirely satisfied with that part of the arrangement.

Taxation on South African Natives.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state whether the Government propose to increase the rates of taxation paid by natives in the Transvaal and other Crown Colonies in South Africa.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No proposal for any increase of taxation on natives is before me; but I consider that the present rate is too low in some cases and does not fairly represent the amount which the natives ought to contribute to the Administration which secures them protection for life and property. The subject will probably be discussed at the Intercolonial Conference at Bloemfontein.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): Is the tax lower or higher than it was under the Transvaal Government?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: That is a very difficult thing to answer, but I believe it is lower. The fact is a fixed rate has been substituted for a number of separate items. I believe the net average result is lower than it was in the time of the Transvaal, but I certainly do not think it was too high.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): Before any tax is agreed to by the Colonial Office, will the House have an opportunity to discuss it?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I cannot promise that. Of course, the House will always have an opportunity of discussing any decision of the Colonial Office.

Transvaal War Contribution.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the agreement by the Transvaal to contribute £30,000,000 towards the cost of the war formed the subject of a despatch from Lord Milner before the Colonial Secretary's journey to South Africa; and whether he will now lay upon the Table of the House all the Correspondence had by the Colonial Office with responsible persons in South Africa on this subject.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The answer to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is in the negative. The question of laying Papers relating to the war contribution is under consideration.

MR. BLACK: Will any of the Papers be available to-morrow?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir.

Free Grants for War Losses.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state how much of the £3,000,000 voted as free grants to the Boers, and of the £2,000,000 voted as free grants to others in South Africa who have suffered war losses has been expended; and, further, will he say in what way these amounts have been expended.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am not in a position to give the information required, but I may inform the hon. Member that the payments made, and the whole of the accounts, will be submitted to the Controller and Auditor-General, who will make a report to the House.

Cyprus.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will favourably consider the petition addressed to him by members of the Legislative Council of Cyprus, praying for some relief from the taxation in that island which has been imposed to meet the tribute assigned to the creditors of the Sublime Porte.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have not yet received the Petition to which the hon. Member refers from the High Commissioner, with his comments upon it. I must point out, however, that no taxation has been imposed for the purpose of meeting the tribute. On the contrary, since the British occupation there has been a substantial remission of taxation in the island, and the British tax-payer has every year had to contribute a considerable sum towards the revenue of the island.

Immigration of Foreign Criminals.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been drawn to the case of a Frenchman, who at the Old Bailey, on the 10th February, 1903, was sentenced to seven years penal servitude for robbery with violence, and who was shown to have been banished from France for ten years after being convicted eight times in that country, and to have been living on the immoral earnings of women in London; and whether representations will be made to the French Government with the object of stopping the deportation to this country of French persons who have been banished from France on account of their criminality.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): My attention has been drawn to the case of the Frenchman referred to. My hon. friend appears to have been misinformed. No sentence of banishment was passed, but the person referred to when convicted in France in December, 1892, and was sentenced to five years imprisonment with ten years *interdiction de séjour*. This is equivalent to police supervision with a prohibition against residence in a specified area.

British Indian Pilgrims to Mecca.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he will say what steps have been taken to secure the payment of the claims of British Indian subjects who have been robbed by brigands when journeying between Jeddah and the Mohammedan shrines of Mecca and Medina; and whether His Majesty's Government will consider the advisability of co-operating with the Netherlands Government in proposing to the Ottoman authorities the necessity for establishing an international police force for the protection of British and Dutch subjects travelling in the Hedjaz.

LORD CRANBORNE: As my right hon. friend and predecessor stated in this House in reply to a Question on the 16th of March, 1900, the claims of British Indian pilgrims for losses by robbery in the Hedjaz between 1892 and 1898 have been settled.† No further information in regard to such claims has been received since that date. His Majesty's Government are not prepared to make the proposal suggested in the last paragraph of the Question.

British Consular Officers in Turkey.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government will be prepared to increase the number of British Consular Officers serving in the European provinces of Turkey; and, if so, to what towns they will be appointed.

LORD CRANBORNE: An addition to the number of Consular Officers employed in the Turkish Empire has been recently made by the appointment of a Vice-Consul at Monastir in consequence of the disturbed state of that district.

Registration of Motor Cars.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will consider the advisability of affording pedestrians and owners of horses and carriages, injured by motor cars, the means furnished by European countries of identifying their owners by a conspicuous number on the motor car.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, lxxx., 1067.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GRANT LAWSON, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): My right hon. friend is in sympathy with the object which my hon. and gallant friend has in view, but legislation would be necessary to give effect to it. The subject, however, is under his consideration.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Is there any hope of legislation? We have had that answer for three years.

MR. GRANT LAWSON: Questions as to the possibility of legislation should, I think, be addressed to the Prime Minister.

Aliens in English Prisons.

MR. POWELL-WILLIAMS (Birmingham, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can now say what numbers of aliens are now in prison; what proportion they bear to the total prison population; and what is the cost of their detention.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): The number of aliens who were in prison on the 2nd instant, when a census was taken, is, so far as can be ascertained, 625; they form about 3 per cent. of the prison population; and the total cost of carrying out their sentences is roughly estimated at £30,000.

MR. POWELL-WILLIAMS: Is there any power to restore these persons to their native country on the expiration of their sentences?

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: No, Sir; I have no statutory powers.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: What percentage does the foreign prison population represent of the whole foreign population in this country?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! Notice of such a Question is obviously necessary.

Postal Order System—Proposed Extension to the Colonies.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General to what portions of the British Empire money may be sent from the United Kingdom by means of postal orders; from what portions of the Empire money may be similarly sent to the United Kingdom; and whether he will take steps to secure an extension of the postal order system so that it shall be available between the United Kingdom and all the Colonies and Dependencies.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): Malta and Gibraltar are the only parts of the British Empire to which money can at present be remitted from the United Kingdom by means of postal orders; but postal orders are procurable for remittances to this country in Malta, Gibraltar, India, the Straits Settlements, Hong Kong, Newfoundland and British Guiana. I have now under consideration the question of extending the postal order system, so that it shall be available between the United Kingdom and other parts of the Empire.

Afforestry in Ireland.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the recommendations of the Departmental Committee of the Board of Agriculture on British Forestry have received the consideration of the Board of Agriculture (Ireland); and whether action will be taken with the object of re-afforesting the country.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I would refer to my reply to the similar Question put to me on the 24th February by the hon. Member for South Kerry.†

Labourers' Cottage Scheme.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that a labourer, named Denis Healy, was the original applicant for a cottage in Scheme No. 6, the site selected being the farm of Mr. R. Barter, in the Mateby division, townland of Coolflugh, of the Cork Rural District, and that the name of Timothy McCarthy, now deceased, was substituted for that of the original applicant; and will he state who is at present the accepted tenant for this cottage.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxviii., 678.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Healy's application was rejected because he was not an agricultural labourer. McCarthy's application for another cottage was not recommended by the Inspector.

Ireland—Peat Fuel.

Mr. SHEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what steps, if any, are being taken by the Irish Government to support a project for largely utilising peat as a fuel when treated by certain scientific processes.

Mr. WYNDHAM: This question is of undoubted interest. It demands, and will receive, the attention of the Government. But it is essential that the name of the Government should not be used to exploit this or that invention. I must therefore decline to make any pronouncement which might be quoted illegitimately to secure financial support from the the public for projects the practicability of which has still to be demonstrated.

Irish Quit Rents.

Mr. O'MARA: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state what proportion of the £35,000 received annually as quit rents, etc., from Ireland by the Commissioners of Woods and Forests is spent in Ireland.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon): The surplus income received annually by the Commissioners of Woods and Forests from quit, etc., rents in Ireland is paid into the Imperial Exchequer, from which of course Ireland receives grants. As this particular revenue is not earmarked, but merged in the general funds of the Exchequer, it is of course impossible to say how or where it is spent.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): Can the Government explain to the House the contradiction between the various statements made yesterday as to the order of business to-day? I understood that the Army Estimates would be taken first.

Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD (Somersetshire, Wellington) was understood to reply that the original statement made by the Leader of the House was that he hoped to get Vote 1 of the Navy and the non-effective Votes, and that to-day would be devoted to the reports of those Votes. The Army and Navy Votes were to be taken at the afternoon sitting. But in consequence of the length of the debate on Vote 1 of the Navy, it was agreed to postpone the report of that Vote till Monday next. In those circumstances it was hoped that the Non-effective Votes, 13, 14 and 15, of the Navy might be taken at an early period that afternoon, and that the rest of the time might be given for the report of the Army Votes A and 1. The first order on the Paper was the report of the Excess Vote taken yesterday.

Mr. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.) said that nothing was said in the statement of the First Lord on Monday about getting the Non-effective Votes to-day. It was not part of the understanding.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said it would be very inconvenient to take the non-effective Votes before the general discussion of the Navy Estimate was finished. He would certainly oppose with all his might the report of the Excess Vote, since the House had not yet had the report of the Accounts Committee.

*Mr. SPEAKER: There could not be a general discussion on the Report Stage of Vote 1.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) asked whether there was any necessity for obtaining these Non-effective Votes before the close of the financial year.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD, the greater part of whose answer was inaudible in the Gallery, was understood to say that it would be an advantage to the House to get these Votes.

MR. BUCHANAN: But am I not right in saying that the arrangement made by the First Lord of the Treasury did not include the taking of the Non-effective Votes?

GENERAL LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): I certainly understood the Secretary to the Navy to promise on the previous day that if the Vote were allowed to be taken a full discussion might again take place on report. Many Members accordingly reserved their remarks for the later stage.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Belfast, W.): It is impossible I should have given such an undertaking. I had no power to do so. What I did say was, that there could be a discussion on Vote 1 in continuation of that on Vote A, and that there would be a further opportunity of discussing Vote 1 when the Report Stage came on.

GENERAL LAURIE: Speaking as one of the Members interested, I must say I was misled.

*THE SPEAKER: I have nothing to do with these understandings or misunderstandings. The Rules of the House on the matter are perfectly clear.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he understood that the first business to be taken on the Vote on Account on Thursday would, at the desire of the Government, be that of the Colonial Office, in order to enable the Colonial Secretary to make a statement. What other business, he asked, would be taken?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, N.): I can answer the hon. Gentleman. The hon. Gentleman has entirely misunderstood the situation. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister stated that the Vote on Account would be put down for Thursday, and that the arrangement of the items in that Vote would depend entirely upon any expression of opinion conveyed to him from any quarter of the House. It being understood that there was a general desire that the Colonial Vote should be put down, that has accordingly been put in the first place; but it is not at the suggestion, request, or desire of the Government, who are in this matter absolutely impartial and perfectly ready to take the discussion of any other item of the Vote on Account if the House so desires. The hon. Gentleman introduced another point. He assumes that this Vote has been put down in order that I, as Colonial Secretary, may make a statement. I wish to say at once that I have no intention of making any statement whatever. My recent proceedings have been fully before the public and the House. I am, of course, ready to give any further explanation which may be desired, or to extend in any way the information which is already in the possession of the House. But I have of my own motion no statement whatever to make.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I thought it was the desire of the right hon. Gentleman himself to make a statement. Of course, as he says not, I at once accept his contradiction.

*MR. BUCHANAN: I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister on this subject. There is clearly a misunderstanding. I understood that on Monday the Prime Minister stated that he wanted on Tuesday afternoon Votes A and 1 for the Navy. These were obtained. Then he said that Wednesday would be devoted to the discussion on the Reports of the Army and Navy Votes. Does not the arrangement to take Non-effective Votes in Committee of Supply go outside that understanding?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I think the hon. Gentleman is mistaken. I mentioned the Non-effective Votes. We must have the Non-effective Votes. What I was chiefly interested in on Monday was to explain to the House the general method of allocating business before the end of the financial year; and, though I mentioned the Non-effective Votes, they were the least important part of the programme laid before the House.

MR. LOUGH: Is there any necessity for these Non-effective Votes being taken before the close of the financial year?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We must have the money. I ought perhaps to give notice now that it will be necessary to-morrow, after the Vote on Account, to take the purely formal stage, which is necessary before we bring in the Appropriation Bill. There are two stages —the Committee stage and the Report stage of Ways and Means—before we introduce the Appropriation Bill. The first must be taken to-morrow. Therefore, when the House meets, I shall move a Resolution enabling us to take that purely formal stage.

*MR. BUCHANAN: What is the legislative necessity for obtaining the Non-effective Votes.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is no statutory obligation to get these particular Votes, but there is a statutory obligation to finish the financial business before March 25th. It is necessary, however, that we should have this money, and I would point out that if we do not we shall have to bring in another Ways and Means Bill at a time when we are pressed with the legislative work of the session.

*MR. BUCHANAN: Then the only necessity is that you want to get a larger amount of money?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order order!

NEW BILLS.

LOCAL RECORDS BILL.

"For the preservation of Public and Private Local Records," presented by Mr. Bull; supported by Mr. Burns, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Atherley-Jones, and Sir Albert Rollit; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 7th April, and to be printed. [Bill 108.]

CROFTERS' HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACT (1886) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend The Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act, 1886," presented by Mr. Weir; supported by Mr. John Dewar, Mr. Leveson-Gower, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Mr. Bignold, Mr. Harmsworth, and Mr. Caldwell; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 109.]

SUPPLY [17th MARCH].

Resolutions reported.

CIVIL SERVICES (EXCESS), 1901–2.

"That a sum, not exceeding £77, 15s. 5d., be granted to His Majesty, to make good an Excess on the Grant for National Gallery of Ireland for the year ended on the 31st day of March, 1902."

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

"That a sum, not exceeding £6,312,800, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses and Wages, etc., to Officers, Seamen and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st of March, 1904."

Resolutions read a second time.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said he proposed to move that the amount be reduced by £50, in order that he might call attention to the situation in which this matter now stood. They had the matter under consideration on the previous day, when he called attention to the fact that hon. Members had not had an opportunity of seeing the report of the Public Accounts Committee on the point. He had since obtained a copy of the report. This was one of the most extraordinary cases of financial irregularity that had ever come before the House of Commons. Sir Walter Armstrong might be a good judge of pictures and of works of art, but evidently he could not keep simple accounts—simple on the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury. Simple as they were he had failed to keep them properly. He had not paid over the money when he should have done, he had not delivered the accounts at the proper time, and, in fact, he had committed every kind of irregularity. In acknowledgment, presumably, of his great financial ability the Treasury recently agreed to raise his salary. The remedy proposed to cope with the present difficulty was altogether inadequate. He would not trouble the House by again reading the catalogue of financial enormities committed by this gentleman; they were all duly set forth in the report of the Controller and Auditor-General, but he would call attention to the report of the Public Accounts Committee which expressed regret that, notwithstanding a previous warning, this accounting officer had again neglected to present his accounts in correct form and at the proper time. The Secretary to the Treasury had admitted the whole case, but instead of doing as would ordinarily have been done, insisting on this official performing his duty or giving place to some one else, he said the only remedy that commended itself to the Treasury was to try and make Sir Walter do the work, and if he failed, to keep the accounts themselves. Surely that was a most inadequate method of dealing with an officer who committed financial irregularities of that kind. The amount involved might be small, but the principle at stake was tremendous. In too many cases the Controller and Auditor-General was unable to adequately perform his duty and secure a complete audit, but when he was able to draw attention to financial irregularities, the Treasury ought to apply more effective remedies. He hoped even now that the Secretary to the Treasury would render it unnecessary to press the Motion for a reduction by giving a more satisfactory account of the intentions of the Department.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (MR. HAYES FISHER, Fulham) said he thought on the previous day he had satisfied the Committee with his explanation. He fully admitted that there had been financial irregularity on the part of Sir Walter Armstrong. The Treasury had complained, the Controller and Auditor-General had complained, and the Public Accounts Committee had fully investigated the matter and had administered a reprimand. He had been asked what the Treasury were going to do in the matte. His reply was that they would try and get Sir Walter Armstrong to keep the accounts properly, and if they could not succeed in that, then the Treasury Remembrancer would see that it was done for him. It was only fair and just to Sir Walter Armstrong to say who he was. He was a man very eminent in the Art world; he had done valuable service for the National Galley in Ireland, and for his services he only received £500 a year. If he were to be pilloried by the House of Commons and if their censure were overdone, he would probably throw up his appointment. He would not be the loser, but the nation would. It was sometimes the case that a man of artistic temperament was not very accurate in keeping accounts, but after what had been said he would, no doubt, be anxious in the future to keep his accounts in proper form. If he did not do so, then he would be afforded the necessary help, for they were most anxious not to lose his services to the nation. He hoped, therefore, his hon. friend would not press his vote of censure.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said the Secretary to the Treasury misapprehended the point of the debate. There was no desire to attack Sir Walter Armstrong, the object was to learn why the Treasury, realising the difficulty, did not make other arrangements for dealing with these accounts. Why not appoint another accounting officer?

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said he was not by any means satisfied with the statement of the Secretary to the Treasury, and he hoped the hon. Gentleman would further consider the matter. At the same time he did not propose to move formally the reduction of the Vote.

First Resolution agreed to.

Consideration of Second Resolution deferred till Monday next.

SUPPLY (NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903 4).

Considered in Committee:—

(In the Committee.)

[MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903-4.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £784,300, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the expense of half-pay, reserved, and retired pay to officers of the Navy and Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he thought it very extraordinary that that Vote should be put in the forefront of the business that day, and he hoped the Prime Minister would not press it. Of course the House ought to meet all the reasonable requests of the Government for Votes to enable them to carry on their work, and to supply the money required for their immediate wants, but certainly he could not agree with the suggestion that more than Vote A and Vote 1 were absolutely required. It was all very well to say that the Non-effective Votes were non-contentious, but there was no certainty that they did not require discussion. He wanted to raise a constitutional question and to show that there was no necessity to take these Votes at once.

The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is wandering away from the Vote.

Mr. LOUGH said that in order to elicit some explanation from the Government he would move to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester E,) said the hon. Member, he was sure, would feel that this was a motion which ought not to be pressed. It was a question not of the convenience of the Government, but of the convenience of the House. These Votes were required in order to fulfil the statutory obligations of the House in regard to financial business, and in order to avoid the necessity of bringing in a Ways and Means Bill a few weeks before the Appropriation Bill, at a period of the session when the House was very pressed in finishing the necessary work of the year.

The only remaining question was whether this was a convenient way of getting this money; he ventured to think it was. These Votes involved no question of principle; they were automatic and had no connection with the naval policy involved. He thought under these circumstances the House might well follow the precedents set in previous years and pass these Votes without discussion.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) protested against what was practically a Vote on Account for the Navy being taken in this way. The only reason for a Vote on Account was to find money to go on with at the commencement of the financial year. That was not necessary with regard to the Navy, because the Votes which the Government had already obtained gave them one-sixth of the whole of the money required for the Navy, and the whole necessity for taking a Vote on Account disappeared. With eight weeks supply the Government were abundantly supplied. The Committee would remember that there had only been a day and a half given to the general discussion of the Army Estimates, and he reminded the Committee that the main increase fell on Vote 8, and, that being so, he appealed to the Government not to take these Votes now, but postpone them and allow the Committee to discuss Vote 8 at an early date.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said if it would conciliate hon. Members opposite he would undertake to bring up Vote 8 for discussion on the day most convenient for hon. Members and their friends to discuss it. It was important that the Government should get this money for the purpose of avoiding a Ways and Means Bill. The hon. Member opposite thought this system of obtaining this money was not the right one, but that view was based on the old methods of procedure before the new method of obtaining Supply was adopted. This was no doubt practically a Vote on Account, and in those days it was very necessary that the Votes on Account should be limited, otherwise Governments might take a vote on account and not touch the Estimates for the rest of the session. That procedure had all been altered; the Government was now obliged every week to submit itself to the criticism of the House, and they left the House to choose the subject for criticism. He thought that hon. Gentlemen ought to be content with the statement that Vote 8 should be brought in on the day most convenient to those who desired to discuss it. He appealed to the House not to interfere with the present procedure of the House.

*Mr. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.) thought that if the Committee allowed these Votes to go through without a protest now they would be told in future years that a precedent had been created; that they had accepted the principle and recognised the reasonableness of the practice that the Government must obtain these Votes before the 31st of March in order to keep them going two or three months.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said the hon. Member argued this question as if the Government could prevent these matters being discussed. That was not the case; they could always be discussed.

*Mr. BUCHANAN said when the money was obtained, whatever the result of a future discussion might be, it would not alter the fact that the control of the House was gone. That was a principle he did not agree with.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said there was some inconvenience in taking these automatic Votes before Votes "A" and "1" had been disposed of, but the argument of the First Lord of the Treasury was a very weighty one. Before the 31st of March the Government must have some money to go on with, and that money must be covered by a Vote of this House. As a matter of fact, these Non-effective Votes were not usually discussed, and it was necessary that the Government should get the money, and if this Motion to report Progress was withdrawn, the question of the Army could be discussed. He would point out that the real question to be discussed on the Army Vote was the Navy; the two questions had to be taken together and when they attacked the Army they were defending the Navy, and he would much rather have the debate on the Army than take a long discussion on these Non-effective Votes.

*Mr. KEARLEY (Devonport) thought that the hon. Member for King's Lynn had overlooked the fact that there were matters of great substance to be discussed on the Non-effective Votes, and matters which ought to be discussed. What he complained of was that the understanding arrived at with the Prime Minister had not been kept. That arrangement was that Votes "1" and "A" should be put down, and those Votes alone. But last night, when the hon. Member for Wellington found he could not get these Votes through, he had placed them first in the orders of the day, and the result was the hon. Gentlemen opposite would be despoiled of their opportunity of discussing the Army Vote, because he himself had a very important matter to bring forward on Vote 14 of these Non-effective Votes.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) did not know whether anything in the nature of an absolute agreement was entered into, but when his right hon. friend was stating what it would be necessary for the Government to have, he distinctly heard him include these Votes.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) said the real objection was that the House were asked to vote, practically without discussion, a sum of £2,400,000. In the present condition of the finances of the country the Government ought not to ask for such a sum without affording the House a fair opportunity for criticism.

Mr. LOUGH suggested that the Government should take Vote 13, and leave over for the present Votes 14 and 15.

Mr. RITCHIE said he was prepared to postpone Vote 14, if the Committee would give Votes 13 and 15.

*Mr. KEARLEY said he had a question to raise on Vote 15 also.

Question put, and negatived.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

2. £350,100, Civil Pensions and Gratuities.

* MR. KEARLEY said he desired to call attention to the disparity between the number of established men in Government civil employment in the dockyards and the number of hired men. There had been a very large increase in employment but no corresponding increase in the establishment. The word "hired" as applied to Government workmen was more or less of a misnomer, because the men were practically permanently employed, and many of them remained in the Government service until they reached the age limit of sixty years.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, N.) asked how the matter was relevant to the Vote, which dealt only with men who had left the Service.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said his hon. friend desired to argue that the number of men entitled to pensions should be larger, but the number could be increased only by increasing the establishment. He submitted that that point was relevant to the Vote.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER pointed out that if they were to be allowed to discuss the position of persons not on the Vote they might discuss every single institution in the Navy.

* MR. KEARLEY submitted that this was the only Vote on which the question of the number on the establishment could be raised, and it was most unfair to try to dispose of the discussion on a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN ruled that the hon. Member could discuss only the question of the pensions of men who had left the dockyards.

* MR. KEARLEY said he could raise the whole question by referring only to men who had left the Service. He would take the case of a man who had been in the Government service forty years and was now on pension. Under the Superannuation Act he had forty-sixtieths of his average emoluments for the last three years in the Service. There was another man who had been employed just as long as a "hired" man and gone out of the Service and had received a gratuity. He had been in the Government employment precisely the same time, but his gratuity was only on the basis of one week's wages for every year served. That was the grievance of a man who had served the Government equally as faithfully. He brought this matter forward on behalf of those now serving, and who would find themselves in a similar predicament at the end of their career. The policy of the Admiralty was to have established men. They wanted to have men they could rely upon under all conditions. In war time or some other time there might be a very great demand for labour outside the Government yards, and unless the Admiralty had a hold on the men, such as they had on the established men, they would lose them. Owing to the very large increase in the Navy the employment in the Government yards had enormously increased, but the number of men established had been altogether disproportionate to the old ratio which prevailed ten years ago. There were 25,689 hired men employed by the Government, and only 6,136 established men. Could the Civil Lord give any assurance that the disparity would be altered? It had been put before the Admiralty over and over again, and what amounted almost to an undertaking was given last year, when a deputation waited on the First Lord, that this question would be inquired into. He did not raise this question in any obstructive spirit, but he thought he was entitled to ask the Admiralty if they had come to any decision on this very important question.

*MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth) supported the hon. Member for Devonport, and said that the only way in which the discrepancy could be remedied was by increasing the number of established men.

GENERAL LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) said this arrangement was all right when they had simply a boom, and they were going to get rid of a large number of men, but now the hired men were required as much as the establishment men, and it would be better to have the establishment increased so that all the men should be placed on the same footing.

MR. PRETYMAN (Suffolk, Woodbridge) said this matter had been most carefully considered by the Admiralty. It was quite true that the numbers in the dockyards had largely increased, and that the number of hired men and establishment men had not been increased in proportion. It should be remembered that a portion of this pension was in the nature of deferred pay, and it should also be borne in mind that the hired men got 21s. and the establishment men 20s.

*MR. KEARLEY said that the men only got 19s. a week, and this was one of the greatest scandals that existed.

MR. PRETYMAN: That may be so at Devonport.

*MR. KEARLEY said that was the case everywhere.

MR. PRETYMAN said what he meant to convey was that 1s. per week more was allowed to the hired labourer than to the establishment labourer. Therefore the hired men got the higher wage during their service. He assured the Committee that this matter was being carefully considered by the Admiralty, although he was not in a position to announce their decision.

*MR. KEARLEY said that under those circumstances he would not press the matter further at this moment, although he could not forget that the hon. Member gave the Committee practically the same assurance last year, but he would expect to know the decision of the Admiralty when Vote 8 came up for discussion.

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

General Laurie.

SUPPLY REPORT (11th MARCH).

Resolution reported:—

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

"That a number of Land Forces, not exceeding 235,761, all ranks, be maintained for the service of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland at Home and Abroad, excluding His Majesty's Indian Possessions, during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

Resolution read a second time.

MR. VICARY GIBBS (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) said he had taken no part in the discussion for reforming the Army, for the reason that he had no special knowledge of Army matters. He had, however, been very much impressed by speeches from his hon. friends the Members for Fareham and Plymouth the other day, and great uneasiness was produced in his mind as to the character and quality of the recruits which were being taken into the Army. He desired on this occasion merely to take the ordinary business view of the matter, and to examine how far the country got good value for its money. He had nothing whatever to say on any question of the Indian frontier, or the proper unit of the British Army, or any question as to the size of the Army. He was merely desirous of giving his right hon. friend an opportunity of allaying the uneasiness which was largely felt by civilians both inside and outside the House of Commons as to the quality of their recruits. The simple proposition he made was that there were accepted and expelled within a short time of their acceptance an unduly large proportion of men. This point he would try to establish very shortly from the Inspector-General's Report. That Report showed that the average expulsion of men with under two years service was about 1,000 for the five years between 1896 and 1900 inclusive; and for the years 1901 and 1902 the average of men so expelled or rejected was over 3,000. The Inspector-General also showed and stated that of 5,000 men enlisted for 1899 over 1,500 were discharged as ineffective within three years, making a proportion of 30 per cent. It might almost be said that his case was proved already by the figures he had quoted from official reports. They all admitted, just as much as the right hon. Gentleman, the difficulty of enlisting satisfactory men.

It was quite true that they had increased the pay and advantages of the Army, but it was equally true that they had not increased the pay and advantages in the same ratio as the pay and advantages of civilians in the same class of life had increased—he referred to the class from which the men in the Army were mainly drawn. The right hon. Gentleman told them that they must have a greatly increased Army, and if it were true that the average standard of comfort had increased throughout the country, and if it were true that the physique of men in the country had not improved, it obviously stood to reason that the difficulties of his right hon. friend's position must be immense. In these circumstances, how did the War Office proceed? Having learned from their experts the number of men considered to be essential to secure the interests of the country, and having secured permission to give those men certain advantages in order to get that number of recruits, he thought the War Office would have adhered rigidly to their standard of efficiency in every respect, and should have struggled in every way they could to raise as many men up to that standard until the 120,000 required had been obtained. If they had failed to reach the number required by maintaining that standard, then the right hon. Gentleman could have come down to the House and told them that instead of getting, say, 120,000, he had only been able to secure say, 90,000; and then he could have left it to the House and the country to choose whether they would keep up a smaller Army, or whether they would vote more pay in order to increase the numbers. As far as he could gather from reading the reports which had been issued, the right hon. Gentleman appeared to have proceeded on completely different lines.

Even if the motto of the War Office be "good men preferred," under all the circumstances the tally must be made up, and men must be had of one sort or another, so that the Secretary of State for War might be able to come down to the House, and say with pardonable pride, or, at any rate with obvious complacency, that he had achieved his object, and that he had got his men. But he had got them at the expense of introducing a lot of wastrels into the Army, and it was not as if it could be alleged that these wastrels were cheap. Some might think that for a soldier to be a bit bad was a kind of half praise. It was not as if they cost the same as the other men, they were paid the same, but what with their diseases and their Court-martials, before they were finished with they cost the country a great deal more. They were not merely worthless in the Army, but they were worth less than nothing. There was no analogy whatever between the advantage of getting inferior recruits into the Army and having a large number of weakly men pulling at a rope. Ten weak men might make up for five stronger men in that case, but ten inferior recruits would not make up for five good recruits in the Army. No greater mistake could be made by anybody than to say: "Well, they may not be so good as we should like to see them, but we have got them, and, *pro tanto*, they are so much to the good." What were the requisites of a modern soldier? Character first, then intelligence, and then physical health and vigour. These were essentials without which men were worse than useless. It was perfectly clear to anyone that modern war made a great many more demands than war used to do on the strength and the *morale* of our troops. Unseen enemies, forced marches, and things of that nature, were factors, and everyone of them pointed the same way. Once it used to be said that it was rapidity of movement that was required, now it was rigidity of purpose. What other demands did war make upon the men? No trifling ones. Self-denial, self-control, discipline, and the very highest and rarest form of discipline, self-discipline, and nobly for the most part had these demands been responded to by the British soldier. There was no room for self-indulgence now-a-days, when a man had to lie for hours and hours on the ground by himself, far away from his fellow-men, with just the little pittance he was able to bring with him, and unable to touch his emergency rations without risk of a few years imprisonment.

An hon. Member on the other side of the House appeared to him the other day to imply that really it was not a bad thing, after all—he would not say that these were his words, but this was the implication of his speech—if a soldier was a bit of a blackguard. These ideas were out of date, and old-fashioned. In modern wars private soldiers did not rub shoulders with one another in battle. They did not get even the encouragement and the stimulus which the hon. Member would desire from hearing one another swear. They lay on the ground forty yards from one another, and perhaps 500 yards from the nearest officer. They had to think and to act for themselves. In such conditions as these would the rascal—would the booby—be the likelier man to serve his country well? No, Sir. He asked confidently, was it businesslike and economical of the House to feed and clothe men who (snapping his fingers) would not be worth that? He hoped he was not misunderstood. He knew that there were many of our soldiers who had fulfilled all the requirements that any man could demand. But the worthless minority was too large. They were no value to the country. They were only valuable so far as they administered to the complacency of the Minister for War. Whom did he mean? He meant the boys who imposed upon a singularly credulous medical officer as to their age. He meant the illiterates who could neither read nor write. He meant the weaklings who suffered from hernia and varicose veins, and last and worst he meant the "bad 'uns"—those sickly sheep who might infect a flock. Why should we have them? Oh, how he wished that he could put one commanding officer into the box here and cross-examine him. He would ask him only a few questions—"How many worthless vagabonds have you had thrust upon you whom, if you had the chance, and if you had a voice in the matter, you would not have looked at?" "How many 'bad 'uns' have you had?" Then he should like to ask what injury these men had done to the Army, setting aside altogether all the waste of the country's time, and of the credit and efficiency of the Army. Next and last he should ask, "How many have you got still, whom you would like to dismiss if you were encouraged instead of thwarted at headquarters?"

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Oh!

*MR. VICARY GIBBS: The right hon. Gentleman said "Oh!" He was sure that "Oh" would be received with satisfaction by commanding officers. They would now know what was to be done by commanding officers when they got men whom they wished to get rid of. He wished the right hon. Gentlemen were determined that all the men of the Army should be drawn from the cream of the population, and none from the scum. [AN HON. MEMBER: "You can't get that."] They could come very much nearer to it than they were now. Let them examine how far the demands on a soldier, which he had mentioned, had been fulfilled, and how far considered. Take first and foremost the matter of character. If it was priggish to desire that the character of these men should be high from regard to their moral welfare, at any rate it was the coldest business instinct which should make the authorities wish for high character on account of the efficiency and the credit of the Army. What they ought to do was to make that profession one which any respectable family would stimulate and press their sturdy and capable sons to take up, not one which they would, as he feared was the case now, do what they could to discourage. It might be said that it was all sentiment to talk about character. Well, were the Marines sentimental? Were they not very shrewd? Did not hon. Members think that if the mere admission into that force was at once an honour and a certificate of character, this very circumstance created a demand for that force. That was not mere declaration. It was proved up to the hilt by the hon. Member for Fareham in a statement which he had made and which had not been contradicted. He supposed if they were going to be as careful about character in soldiers as they were in the case of Marines, it might be said that they were going to turn them into psalm singers. He was not uneasy about that. But supposing they were going to do so, England had had one or two historical lessons. Two hundred and fifty years ago in this country she had a lesson that psalmsinging and fighting went very well together. Fifty years ago she had the same lesson in India at the Mutiny, and not so very long ago she had a lesson from our enemies in South Africa. He was basing this argument on the facts given by the hon. Member for Fareham, but his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War, to use his own words, gave these facts and arguments the go by. That was his language, because he regarded them as not germane to the issue then before the House. He had not the military education of the hon. Member for Fareham, but at any rate it could not be pleaded that his remarks were not germane to the issue, and the right hon. Gentleman would not wish to do otherwise than to meet him fairly and to show him where and why he was wrong.

They all admitted that they wanted intelligence in the soldier. What were they doing for that? They had 1,000 illiterates last year, and these were the words of the Inspector-General—

> "There is a material falling off in well-educated recruits, although," he proudly added. "the number of those able to read and write is increasing."

He had no hesitation in saying the fact that such a statement was possible was a scandal and disgrace to them all. It was a scandal and a disgrace that the conditions of modern warfare were so little recognised that it should be thought desirable to capture such men with the present chances of education existing in the country. To-day the illiterate was not the least like the illiterate of a hundred years ago. The illiterate was now a booby, and one of the triumphs was that we secured 1,000 boobies last year. He would now deal with the question of age. Two thousand men under the age of seventeen were taken last year. Were they all drummers and pipers? If they were, there might be a plan to remodel the British Army on the lines of that of the Highland chieftain who invaded his neighbour's territory—

"Since he did resolve
To extirpate the vipers,
With three and twenty men,
And five and thirty pipers.

Of course that was not so. Let him give as an illustration of this age matter a case that came before him personally. It was not a singular case, and many hon. Members could produce the like. But one concrete case produced more impression than fifty hypothetical ones or instances reported at second hand. A keeper on his father's estate came to him in great distress two years ago because one of his boys had run away. How old did hon. Members think the boy was? He was between fourteen and fifteen years of age! The next thing they heard of that boy was that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War had clasped him to his arms! A very few months after that the boy was in Malta on foreign service. No investigation had been made, not a word had been said to the lad. Nothing could have been easier than to say to that young rascal, "Where do you come from? Let us know and we will write." And in twenty-four hours if they had written to the clergyman, or the squire of Aldenham, they could have got the facts about the boy, who his father was, whether he was worth anything, and how old he was. "Oh! it is not worth while," the War Office might reply, "that is too expensive." He would come to the question of expense shortly. Surely the limit of eighteen was young enough. Let them think for a moment that under modern conditions, under the modern system, these boys only served three years with the Colours. According to the right hon. Gentleman, they were not to go to India until they were twenty, and therefore for two-thirds of their time these boys were unfit to go abroad or form part of an expeditionary force. When the limit was put down so low as that they should, for goodness sake, keep to it.

His hon. and gallant friend, the Member for Taunton, was quite right in the question he had put that afternoon when he wanted a minute and clear distinction between the men who were available for military service abroad and those who were not; and that all the men should not be bunched together so that they did not know what they had got, what they could use and what they could not use. Each of these boys cost the country £65 a year. That was the official Estimate, but if the matter were approached on business lines it was found that he cost a great deal more. What did the right hon. Gentleman get his salary for? And what were the Staff at the War Office paid for? It was all for the Army; and if they had no Army he assumed that the right hon. Gentleman would receive no salary in his particular capacity as Secretary of State for War, while they would lose the inestimable benefit of the services of the War Office. As it was, they had got to be paid because there was an Army; and every member of the Army should be debited with a share of these salaries if the Army was going to be conducted on business lines. If so, up went in a minute the cost of each soldier from £65 to something like £100.

The next requisite he asked for in a soldier was physical vigour and health. It was not that these recruits were boys that made him so much disturbed in mind. Boys not fit for the Army now might become so. It was the presence in the Army of those fellows who never would be worth the value of their boots to the nation, that he resented. They were called specials, whether they were so or not in every sense. He would tell the House of a story of what passed between a very distinguished friend of his and a sailor in a train, and what the sailor said. He knew very well that what the soldier said was not evidence; and he dared say that that applied also to the sailor. But he thought the story might afford a very valuable lesson to the House as to the way these things were looked upon. He did not set up to be a military or a naval expert, and he did not know the proper title of the sailor, but he understood that the sailor held a post equivalent in the Navy to that of a recruiting sergeant in the Army. The sailor complained to his friend very bitterly that so many men who came forward as candidates for the Navy had to be rejected owing to physical unfitness. His friend indulged in the usual platitude that that was very sad. "Oh, no," said the sailor, "not sad for us at all, because in the end we get the men we want, and of the right quality." His friend replied, "I did not mean that; I meant sad for them." The sailor retorted "not that either, for they are all right; they all go into the Army, and the Army is glad to get them." Well, that might be the sailor's jealousy of the Army service.

*MR. BRODRICK: Hear, hear.

MR. VICARY GIBBS: Yes, he thought that would be the official answer. What was the meaning of the quotation he was going to read from the speech of his valued mentor the hon. Member for Fareham? What did a commanding officer say to his hon. friend?

> "Out of 180 men recently received 105 were below the standard, or in other words"

said the commanding officer, name unknown, with a spitefulness he hoped he would not imitate—

> "they were specials, though not so described."

*MR. BRODRICK said he had asked his hon. friend the Member for Fareham to be kind enough to give a reference to the name of the commanding officer in order that he might verify the statement; and his hon. friend declined to give him the reference, in which he might have been justified. But he hardly thought that an argument could be founded on a statement unless they knew the authority on which it was made.

MR. VICARY GIBBS: Was there then to be one law for the rich and another for the poor; one law for the Minister and another for the poor private? Unless his memory suddenly failed him the right hon. Gentleman did not disclose the names of the experts on whose advice he relied in proposing his Army scheme, although there were cries in the House of "Name, name."

*MR. BRODRICK said he did not know to what the hon. Member referred.

MR. VICARY GIBBS said that it was during the general discussion on the policy of forming an expeditionary force. He would look up the passage and if it did not bear out what he was saying he would express regret to the House and the right hon. Gentleman. The Secretary for War said that no argument was to be founded on the statement quoted by the hon. Member for Fareham.

That reduced him to be brutally plain. There were three possibilities open to the House to consider. First, that the hon. Member for Fareham had invented the story which he said he had from a commanding officer. Second, it was very possible that the commanding officer—he could say this, because that gentleman was not in the House, and, according to the admirable rules of this ancient Assembly, it was not out of order to insult or libel any person outside the House—it was very possible that the commanding officer lied to the hon. Member for Fareham. But if neither of these possibilities was accepted, then there was naturally something rotten in the state of Denmark. This commanding officer said that these men were taken in heaps, and that 105 out of 180 were specials. That seemed almost incredible, though the commanding officer went on to say that "they were not so-called." Well, without being a Heaven-born Minister of War, he thought that a man was not a special by simply not so describing him. He fully believed his right hon. friend when he undertook before this House that there should be no more specials taken. He had no doubt the right hon. Gentleman meant that, and that he was to accept from the right hon. Gentleman that that was to be the established principle for the future, and that it would not be gone back from without the House having an opportunity of discussing the question.

*Mr. BRODRICK admitted that he had said that in future specials would not be taken; but supposing that his military advisers, while Parliament was not sitting, advised that specials should be taken in certain cases, he should be bound to consider their advice. That would alter the position.

Mr. VICARY GIBBS said that that was not very satisfactory, for, of course, they could never know when the right hon. Gentleman's decision might be altered. At present they had the right hon. Gentleman in the frame of mind in which they wanted to see him in regard to stopping the enlistment of specials; but if that was his policy, were they not placed in an alarming dilemma? The right hon. Gentleman had told the House that he wanted 50,000 recruits every year for his Army scheme. Last year was a bumper year—certainly far above the average—and he got 51,000. But among these 51,000 recruits he would find 8,000 specials. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War was going to be good now, and never have any more specials. Take 8,000 from 51,000 and there remained, he believed, 43,000. Well, how was that shortage to be made up this year? What were the right hon. Gentleman's prospects if he were to remain the fixed immovable North Star, according to his natural habits? Were these to be realised by making the standard elastic? That was a nice word and a very useful word. He did not see how it was to be done, even if the Secretary for War got specials, or offered a larger stimulus to good men to enter the Army. And the House should remember that he was still allowing for a thousand men who could not read and write who were not specials. Last year, said the Inspector-General of Recruiting, recruits were bad for the first nine months, but in October there was a great improvement. That synchronised with the first murmur which was heard that men were not being obtained under this scheme. No doubt it was purely a coincidence, but it led him to suggest that it would be a capital thing if they could have quarterly reports with reference to recruiting presented to Parliament. He ventured to press that on the right hon. Gentleman. With reference to numbers, his right hon. friend said that he was only 2,300 short; but he learned from a commanding officer—he too had commanding officers—that his battalion was 450 men short, and that other battalions were in the same condition. If that were typical of the Army, what was the total shortage? He saw what the official answer would be. It would be details here, details there, details at the depôts, and details everywhere, except under their commanding officer. He would put a question to the right hon. Gentleman which would exclude details. He would ask him whether he would give the number of men now actually with the Colours, who were available for foreign service to-day. He was sure his right hon friend would give the House the numbers. His right hon. friend liked numbers;

he revelled in numbers; and, sometimes, he almost flooded the House with numbers. Looking back to those happy days when his hon. friend the Member for the Whitby Division and his right hon. friend took counsel together, he thought his right hon. friend might say with Pope, although certainly not in the same sense—

> "As yet a child, nor yet a fool to fame;
> I lisped in numbers ———."

He was quite sure that the right hon. Gentleman, with pardonable pride in the success of his scheme, might complete the line—

> "For the numbers came."

It seemed to be imagined that all schemes for greater efficiency in the Army cost more money. He denied that. The process of finding out whether the Army was getting a rascal or a good man, on the testimony of people who knew him, would cost only the initial expense of a postcard. They had in the Army 25,000 inefficients, who would never do a hand's turn in time of war. That number at £60 a head, which was the lowest estimate he had ever heard, amounted to £1,500,000. A lot of postcards could be sent for that amount, especially Government postcards, which did not require a stamp. It was admitted that in every battalion three-eighths were ineffective for foreign service, but if the minimum age of entry was eighteen, and if no man was sent to India under twenty, two-sevenths must be always available as far as the Indian Frontier was concerned. But of course the average age of admission was over eighteen; and if there was no wilful enlisting of men under eighteen the average would, he assumed, be something over nineteen; then only one-eighth would be ineffective on the score of age. Yet, of the men required for South Africa three-eighths were ineffective. How were the other two-eighths to be accounted for? He thought it was a very liberal estimate that on any given date the amount of legitimate disease among men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five might fairly be put at 5 per cent. Still, 20 per cent. were unaccounted for, whom he certainly maintained should never have been enlisted. The average recruiting was about 40,000 men per annum; 20 per cent. of that was 8,000; and looking at the Inspector-General's report he found that that was almost precisely the number which was annually ejected from the Army for serious crime. Would the right hon. Gentleman reply by stating that the War Office had taken such tremendous pains that no man went to South Africa unless he were fit for it, and were now being attacked because of their own virtues? Every commanding officer and every medical man in South Africa had, however, another story to tell. They would say that men had to be left at the base; that men had to be kept out of the fighting line; and that men had got into the fighting line who would have been better left out. He had no hesitation in saying that many of the disasters which occurred in South Africa, and all the discredit, was due to the presence of that unsatisfactory minority in the Army.

Every year there were turned out of the Army 8,000 men; but by turning out 8,000 men they did not get rid of all the worthless fellows. They only got rid of that particular number in that particular year. He did not think it was an exaggerated estimate that when they turned out 8,000 men per year they had always in the Army a minimum of 20,000 men who were worth nothing, and probably worse than worth nothing. Other nations did not show that proportion. They did not have to weed out the same number of men. Of course the reply would be that they had an immense advantage over this country, because they had the whole of their population to pick from; but his reply to that was that when they went to war they did not propose to go to war with themselves, but with someone else; and it would be no use telling the enemy that he had a very unfair advantage over them. They could not say: "You have got finer men; it is not fair, and we cannot fight you." It was not a case of little boys playing at school; it was a matter of life and death to the country. He said that whatever else they did they should not enter into a war when the enemy had the advantage, and that would be the result if they enlisted inferior men. The right hon. Gentleman should not let the country live in a fool's paradise and let it suppose that they had got 120,000 available men when the fact was that they were only paying for 120,000 men. These paper soldiers and this stage Army would make no impression on the potential enemies of this country any more than cardboard castles in China would impress civilised troops. That would not impose on their enemies. It had ceased to impose on the House of Commons; and was it worth keeping up merely for the purpose of imposing on the taxpayers? Let the War Office not shoot any more rubbish into the British Army, and let his right hon. friend give his medical men stringent orders as to the first examination. That was where the great mischief occurred. Let the right hon. Gentleman tell his recruiting officers that they must find out about the character of the men they enlisted. Let him tell them that their own military future depended not on quantity but quality. Let him do that, and there would be a complete revolution in the present system. The commanding officers had certain drastic powers in many respects; then why do not they have drastic powers to get rid of the men who were no use in time of war and who were a nuisance in times of peace. In Dryden's time there must have been a similar War Office to the present, because he found the poet saying—

> "Mouths without hands maintained at vast expense,
> In peace a charge, in war a weak defence."

Let the right hon. Gentleman not admit any one into the Army under age or without a character, and the next time a war broke out it would not be necessary for him to come down to the House and tell them that three-eighths of our Regular Army were unfit for foreign service. He had pointed out, he was afraid at some length, what were in his opinion the qualifications of a soldier and how those qualifications might be obtained, and it only remained for him to move that the Vote be reduced by 3,000 men.

*MR. BECKETT (York, N.R., Whitby) seconded the Motion. His hon. friend, as he had said, had approached this subject from the point of view of a business man with the idea of finding out whether the country got value for its money, and he himself felt bound to admit that in his opinion, on the matter of troops, it certainly did not. These serious charges were a vast burden on the nation. He had heard an hon. Baronet, who represented a Scotch constituency, state that his constituents did not mind how much they were called upon to pay in taxes, which was strange when we remember that he sits for a Scotch constituency; but he was afraid there were many constituencies who did not share the zeal of Glasgow in this matter. The Government did not seem to appreciate the fact that there was a point beyond which taxation could not go; a point at which the resources of the country could not meet it; a point at which the electors of the country would refuse to sanction it. When income was limited people should spend most on articles of first necessity, and least on matters of secondary importance. Supposing the national income to be limited, was it not a serious matter to be spending as much on an Army, which was only of secondary importance, as on the Navy which was a matter of prime necessity? The men in the Navy required a much more expensive training, and the materials, guns and ships were much more expensive than anything corresponding to them in the Army, and on that ground alone the Army ought to cost less than the Navy; but when the relative uses of the two forces were compared the disproportion in cost became more glaring and more inexcusable. The Prime Minister had made some priceless admissions. He had admitted that the Navy stood absolutely first, that they did not now hear that a large Army was not required for home defence, that the defence of this country must be trusted to the Volunteers and citizens of the country. All these admissions showed a great change in the attitude of the Government. The Secretary of State for War had accused the House of having changed its attitude on this matter. That accusation did not amount to much in any case, but what would have been said by hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House if, when a responsible Minister came down to the House in a time of storm and stress, during a great war, and asked for a number of troops, they were refused? "Pro-Boer" would have been the most mild adjective. The right hon. Gentleman appeared to accept the Volunteer Army with difficulty, and had not been converted. Like the disciplinarians in Pall Mall, he seemed to consider that unless a man was taught the goose-step he must be a useless particle of a disorganised mob. But one of the most conspicuous lessons of the war had been that half-trained men made one of the best mounted fighting forces that one could have. The lesson we had learned was that we could rely mainly on the Volunteers for the defence of this country. Under the scheme of his hon. friend they would, of course have a stiffening of Regulars.

*MR. BRODRICK: In the hon. Member for Plymouth's proposal these Regulars did not exist.

*MR. BECKETT said the hon. Member for Plymouth had never suggested that all the Regulars should be taken out of the country, and that remark of the right hon. Gentleman alone showed how much this question had been misunderstood. An Army was of no use unless it was properly trained, organised and efficient from top to bottom. With regard to efficiency it should be first of all intelligently directed. He would rather put his money on brain power than on chest expansion. The Intelligence Department had not been strengthened as it should have been. The comparison with Germany ought to be insisted upon.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order order! On the Report of this Vote the hon. Member cannot go into the question of the efficiency of the Intelligence Department. He can go into anything relating to the number of men.

*MR. BECKETT said the point of his argument was that if the Army was intelligently directed fewer men would be required. The War Office had entirely failed to prove that the Army was properly organised for the necessities of the country. The Secretary of State had never yet been able to show that in the event of an outbreak of war we should have this expeditionary force ready to despatch at a moment's notice, without mobilisation, and so forth. All were agreed as to the absolute necessity of such an expeditionary force. Everybody admitted the wonderful change brought about in the situation in South Africa by the despatch of 10,000 men from India, and but for the arrival of that expeditionary force in the nick of time Ladysmith might have fallen. The value of such a force had been clearly demonstrated, but under the present scheme no such force would be provided; hence much of his opposition. The force could not be provided, because the organisation of the Army was based on the linked-battalion system. The Secretary to the Admiralty, who was an expert in the question of Army reform, in a valuable work, the statements of which had never been overthrown, had advocated the abolition of the present practice of maintaining one battalion as a depôt for another. He said:—

> "It is dangerous and useless. There is no reason whatever why a whole battalion should be made ineffective in order that another battalion may be supplied with recruits. It is difficult to exhaust the catalogue of the disadvantages which attach to this system, but chief among them is the fact that under it no battalion at home is ever fit for war."

On the admission of experts the system had broken down, and it was a confession of hopeless incompetence on the part of the War Office to say that they could not devise a better system to take its place. What was the strength of the Army? The Secretary of State, in an interruption, had said that an argument should not be founded on a statement unless that statement could be examined. But the right hon. Gentleman himself had made a statement as to the strength of the Army which he would not allow the House to examine. Question after question had been asked as to the statement, but the right hon. Gentleman would not supply the details because they were so inaccurate. It was an extraordinary proposition in mathematics to say that you could make up a sum, of which all the details were inaccurate, and yet arrive at a total which was absolutely correct. He had been told on the authority of an Army man that the strength was made up of recruits who were pitch-forked into the Army from the depôts before they were properly trained, of "specials," of reservists on working furlough, of soldiers serving extended terms, and of invalids from South Africa. If all these were included the total might be correct.

*MR. BRODRICK: said he explained to the House the other day that all the men who were on working furlough had been excluded from the strength of the Army and counted in their proper positions. Those who were about to go to the Reserve had been counted with the Reserve.

*MR. BECKETT: The 60,000?

*MR. BRODRICK said that some had been discharged altogether, but the remainder were due for the Reserve, and could be called out if necessary.

*MR. BECKETT said there was no doubt the battalions were much below strength. As to the training of the Army, the principal place for which was Aldershot, the following statement had been made to him—

> "We have 25,000 men at Aldershot operating over 2,500 acres—ten men to the acre. There is absolutely no outlet around Aldershot that is worth talking about. No one who has not been through the mill can picture the state of mind to which a general, colonel, or captain is reduced after two years at Aldershot."

As regarded the other training grounds, what did they find?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! This matter will arise on another Vote.

*MR. BECKETT said in that case he would defer his remarks on that subject. It had been said that the people of this country were invited to pay for an expeditionary force of 120,000 men to defend the Indian Frontier. Without discussing the question, he would merely say that that was a two-edged argument. If the people of this country were to be told they must pay income tax, sugar tax, and so forth for the defence of the Indian Frontier, he greatly feared the "Perish India" school would receive various reinforcements. It was a dangerous argument. The people would naturally ask what the Indian Army was for. Hitherto India had been considered to be self-supporting, but that did not mean that in case of emergency England should not go to her assistance, or even that India should not come to the assistance of England if necessary. He might point out, however, that when we were on the verge of war with Russia in 1878 we did not send an Army corps to India, but India sent troops to Malta. Various epithets had been applied to the critics of the War Office. They had been called "amateurs" and "reactionaries." In one respect they were amateurs. They could not present their case to the House with the trained grace of the Secretary of State for War, or the force and charm of the Prime Minister. Those right hon. Gentlemen had been trained in the art and practice of debate, while he and his friends had been sitting on the back benches listening in awe and admiration. The Secretary of State had very fairly asked, "For whom do you speak? What military authority have you at your back?" He could assure his right hon. friend that the facts they had stated, which had not been questioned, and the arguments they had adduced, which had not been answered, had been supplied to them by various military authorities; they could not have evolved their case from their own brain. If the right hon. Gentleman got outside the atmosphere of the War Office, where people were not always free to speak what was in their minds, or if he would inquire in the Army, without it being known who he was, he would find there was a very strong feeling against this scheme. It was that feeling that the critics of the War Office were voicing in the House, believing that the feeling was so strong that sooner or later it would be adopted by the nation.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out '235,761,' and insert '232,761.'"—(*Mr. Vicary Gibbs.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Resolution.

MR. ELLIOT (Durham) said that although he spoke from below the Gangway he did not speak as a representative of much of the discontent which had lately shown itself in that quarter.

Underlying the Amendment which had been moved, and also the more serious Motion of a few days ago, there was the fact that the Government took a certain view of the necessities of the country. We had lately passed through a period of national anxiety and considerable peril. Eighteen months ago we had about 300,000 men locked up in South Africa, and everybody must have felt that if another war had broken out then the country at home was not in that state of security in which such a nation as ours should be. The Government, having looked at the conditions of the day and the events of the last few years, had come to the conclusion, which he heartily supported, that something ought to be done to strengthen, not only the Navy, but also the Army. He could not say that he regarded altogether with any feeling of tolerance the proposals of those representing the people who, a short time ago, were clamouring against the War Office. He was not referring simply to hon. Members, but also to the Press of this country, for their denunciations of the War Office. They protested loudly against the indefensible position in which the country stood, and now, when a scheme was put forward to remedy that state of things, they made one of the principal features of their criticism the exaggerated strength of the Army which was now proposed. The position of this country was extremely serious, and upon a question of this sort they ought not to blow hot and cold at one time. They should take either one side or the other. They ought to remember that the War Office was what this House and the country made it. Surely it was hardly fair that Parliament should refuse to enable the War Office to do what the country had demanded. The Member for St. Albans, in a very amusing speech, said it was a great misfortune that unsuitable and unfit men should be recruited in the Army and counted in the strength of the Army. One would imagine from the speeches that these specials were the men who upheld and maintained the honour of the British Army. He maintained that the men who went out to South Africa were a very fine Army, and no doubt it was the proper thing to leave behind those who were considered unfit. The men who were sent out to South Africa were fine representatives of the vigour, and pluck, and character of the country, and he greatly deprecated the language which had been used this afternoon.

He had spoken to the late Colonel Henderson about matters in South Africa, and he had told him that he had no doubt whatever concerning the men this country sent out to South Africa; coming into the Army voluntarily from an active life, in the mere matter of marching there was not a conscript army in Europe which could touch them. The bad recruits were left behind, and that was the right place for them. The right hon. Gentleman ought to take such measures as were required to prevent the introduction of unfit men into the Army. He would remind the House that the history of this country did not begin with the Boer War, and to learn lessons from the late war did not necessarily mean that they should forget every lesson they had learned from other wars. The great lesson they had learned from the Boer War was that they could not do everything at the last moment, and to be prepared, they must make an enormous effort to get the right number of men. The country thought the state of the Army was unsatisfactory at the commencement of the war, and now proposals were being made to remedy it. Those who were opposing this scheme had not produced any alternative scheme. He really must ask whether some hon. Gentlemen had present to their mind what the British Army was wanted for. The hon. Member for Oldham was positively shocked the other day, and showed considerable emotion at the thought that the Secretary of State for War had some idea of circumstances arising under which British troops would be pitted against Continental troops, and he even went so far as to look at the dictionary in order to see the real meaning of the word "pitted." He personally was convinced that just as they had fought in the past so they would have to fight in the future. Did anybody really suppose that the circumstances of the old days were absolutely past, and that in future all that would happen in the case of war with a Continental Power would be our magnificent fleet pursuing an inferior fleet? Such a state of things was unthinkable, and he could not imagine a war between Great Britain and a Continental

Power in which the British Army would not be required.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): Not in Europe.

Mr. ELLIOT said that when the safety of Belgium was threatened many years ago Mr. Gladstone came and asked for a vote of 20,000 men in order to support the independence of Belgium. Mr. Gladstone did not then suppose that British troops would never be required on the Continent of Europe. Almost every year produced an example to the contrary. In the year 1878, when the Indian troops were brought to the Mediterranean, they were not brought there simply to garrison Malta. There was hardly a war in which they had been engaged where it was not shown that it was present to the minds of statesmen that English troops would almost necessarily have to be engaged. He should not like them to dismiss from consideration the possibility of foreign troops being landed in this country, and, at any rate, where matters were doubtful, the Government ought to be on the safe side. They should not be blind to facts. Naval warfare at the present time was an experiment, and nobody knew exactly what would happen. Therefore, as the Government were the trustees of the honour and security of the United Kingdom, he should like them to be on the safe side, and they should not believe that large masses of troops could not be landed on the shores of this country, for he knew many very eminent authorities who admitted the possibility of landing large forces of foreign troops on our shores. Considering all these possibilities how could they, with any sort of consistency, declare that the Government were asking for more than was necessary to protect this country from danger. If after having gone through perilous times, and through days when they had no friends on the Continent of Europe—if under circumstances of this kind His Majesty's Government came down to the House of Commons and declared that they required so many hundred thousand men, surely it was a distinct vote of want of confidence in them to attempt to say that they did not want so many men.

He was perfectly well aware that it was an unpopular thing to keep up taxes, but the question was—ought they not in this House to give some sort of lead to the people, and some sort of steadiness to the politics of the country? If some individual or newspaper that a year or two ago was denouncing the Government for not having made sufficient effort was now denouncing them for overdoing it, he would not associate himself with that individual or that newspaper. He did not think that was the way these matters ought to be dealt with. Once or twice lately he had heard with some surprise reference made to the great name of Sir Robert Peel. They might hear mentioned with high approval in the same quarter the distinguished name of John Bright. They might hear that the Manchester school was not the contemptible school it was supposed to be. They had all much to say for themselves but he said—let them not oscillate so violently from one extreme to the other, because it weakened all of them in the country.

The Leader of the House talked the other day about the Indian Frontier. He confessed that it was rather startling to him to hear from his hon. friends that there was no use keeping a considerable army available for the defence of that frontier. Did they not all know, without being gifted with the power of prophecy, that if they read the day after to-morrow of the advance of Russia upon Herat, there would be letters and telegrams home from the Commander-in-Chief in India calling for more troops at once. The very gentlemen who now said there should be no preparation would turn to the War Office and say "What are you doing? You are leaving India unassisted to withstand the whole power of Russia." But the Leader of the House made a remark which really weighed more with him than that in regard to the Indian Frontier, which, after all, was only an illustration. He said that every war necessarily brought with it surprises. That might be a truism, but it was a truism which he hoped would sink deep into the minds of his countrymen. He himself would be more surprised than he could well express, if the war was of the character suggested by some of his hon. friends below the Gangway—a war in which no British troops were employed, and in which nothing surprising happened in connection with the Navy and the defences of the country. He did ask the House to take a serious view of these things. Why did not his hon. friends say what they meant? If they meant to reduce the Army by 30,000, or by 3,000 ineffective blackguards, or boobies, let them put it on paper, and then the House would know what it was doing; but the proposal on the Paper was to reduce the Army by 3,000 men, irrespective of the question of their being effective or ineffective. They had no right to read into that proposal words which they did not put on the paper. There was no suggestion about quality. The proposal was to reduce the total effective force, and all these outcries about the way the money was being wasted were really based on the contention that the Army was bigger than was required for the safety of the country. He had spoken with some warmth, but he felt—and he hoped the country felt—that, in these days the Government were making sacrifices in asking the House of Commons to support the strength of the Empire, and as long as he was prepared to vote any sort of confidence in His Majesty's Government he should certainly be the last to go into the Lobby with those who would make such an imprudent and ill-considered reduction of His Majesty's forces.

*MR. BRODRICK: Nobody who has heard my hon. friend can doubt the effect that his speech has created, or the extent to which his voice was representative of a large majority of the Members of this House. If it is any satisfaction to my hon. friend to know that he does not stand alone in these views, I can tell him that the number of letters I have received in the same sense in the last few days would give him any confirmation he requires as to the views he has expressed, and as to the action taken by my hon. friends below the Gangway. When I heard the speech of my hon. friend the Member for St. Albans I hoped that no such speech as that which has just been delivered would have been necessary in this debate. His speech gave us the hope of a comfortable and edifying discussion upon the inferiority of certain recruits taken into the Army, and his Amendment, as I understand it, was only devoted to knocking off such men as he believed might be knocked off without decreasing the fighting strength of the Army. But from the moment my hon. friend the Member for Whitby got up we saw at once the old cloven foot of reduction, not for efficiency but for economy, as he puts it, and it was made perfectly clear that this reduction of 3,000 men was only a sort of offshoot of the reduction of 27,000 men which my hon. friend and his supporters ineffectually pressed upon the House of Commons last week. Now, Sir, I think I might be held absolved from answering the hon. Member for Whitby. None of his arguments were new. They have been urged before, and if I may say so without offence his speech was a belated speech. It ran like a speech which was intended to be delivered last week and somehow was not delivered, and the effect of it was that he advanced again arguments which have already been refuted.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: Oh!

*MR. BRODRICK: Well, the hon. Member for Oldham does not agree; but, after all, we must be allowed our opinions—opinions which are based on convictions that I hope are equally shared on those Benches.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): Does my right hon. friend mean that we are not acting on our convictions? [Cries of "Order."]

*MR. BRODRICK: My noble friend should know that the practice of the House of Commons pays no respect to authority of any description, and I really think that until he becomes the custodian of the order of the House by sitting in the Chair he may leave it to Mr. Speaker to correct Members who are out of order. I am only concerned to refute three or four mis-statements which my hon. friend the Member for Whitby allowed to crop up in his speech, and I refute them not for the purpose of making good the position of the War Office, but because in this matter the British Government are the custodians of the honour of the country, and at the same time of the capacity of the country. I have no right to allow mis-statements of that character to pass. In the first place he says that we failed in the war because none of the battalions were prepared for the war. That is an absolute fallacy. There is not a shadow or shred of foundation for it. The battalions which went out from Aldershot and other parts of the United Kingdom were ready with their Reserves before the ships could possibly embark them, and when they arrived there they fought side by side with battalions from India, which were made up of trained soldiers. I venture to say that there is no justification whatever for the statement of my hon. friend. Is there any hon. Member who will get up and go so far as to say that he can quote anonymously any officer who declared that the battalions that went from England with Reserves fought less well in Natal than any other battalions? Then my hon. friend said that we had not an expeditionary force which would ever leave this country with Reserves for service in India. The hon. Member's interest in Army matters, so far as his appearances in this House are concerned, has been somewhat recent. I do not think that he has taken the interest in Army matters which some of my hon. and gallant friends have done in past years. If he had done so, he would have known that before the war a special Reserve was being organised by our paying extra to men who wished to enrol in this special Reserve, not exceeding 5,000. That would have enabled us to put a moderate force for a small expedition of 12,000 into the field without coming to Parliament on the subject. My hon. friend again called attention to statements which I have made from this Bench as to the numbers of the Army, and maintained that, unless I could produce at that moment the details relating to every battalion and every place, what I said must be regarded as the product of my brain or of some one at the War Office. Now, I do protest in these matters against imputations being made against any office of what is practically bad faith. If the Adjutant-General of the Army and his Department, or indeed any Department, are not to be believed when they tell the House that the Army is of a certain strength in numbers, I think all faith in official statements of all kinds must be put aside. To say that these figures are no more to be relied upon, because I do not cite my authority, than the anonymous statements which are now hawked before the House, made by officers whose names are not given, seems to me to be pressing Parliamentary licence very far.

MR. BECKETT: I never said the figures were not to be relied upon. I only asked for details of the total.

*MR. BRODRICK: I told my hon. friend what I again tell the House, that when it is possible to give details which will be of any value to the House I shall be glad to give them. That will be in a few weeks, when the trooping season now going on is over, and when the drafts coming to and from India have reached their destinations, when the 18,000 men on furlough will either have gone to the Reserve or returned to their regiments, when, in fact, all that is going on in the twelve or fifteen ships which are running to and from South Africa returns to something like a normal condition. Up to that time we can only give you the total strength of the Army so far as I have been able to judge. But I renew my challenge to my hon. friend. My challenge was not as to whether there were officers who might disagree with the particular scheme adopted by the Government; my challenge was to cite any military officer of high authority who was willing to vouch for the 27,000 men whom it was proposed to deduct from the Army. I make that challenge again. I do not want the opinion of the hon. Member for Oldham or the hon. Member for Whitby on this point. I do not give the House my opinion as being my opinion; I give it on the opinion of the military advisers, past and present, of the War Office, who are the most eminent military men of the day—not the servants of one Government but of both Governments; not men selected on any ground except that of their being the best representatives of the Army and the men who have seen most of field service. I say the opinions given by those men should not be set aside for any anonymous opinion which is unvouched for, and of which all we know is that it has been given by a military man. I wait until my hon. friend gets up, or some of his supporters get up, to tell us who there is, who has real field experience and knowledge, and whose opinion may weigh with the House, who is in favour of decreasing the Army by 27,000 men.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I am in possession of the name of an authority, who will be recognised, I think, by everybody in this House, whose opinion is to the effect that the Army could be very largely reduced indeed. I have that gentleman's authority to use my judgment in this matter, and I should propose to give his name to the Prime Minister. [Cries of "Oh."]

*MR. BRODRICK: I shall await the result of that action with great complacency. I said when I rose that I thought this Question which is now before the House was one which should not be obscured by the great issue which the House decided last week. I think there was in the speech of my hon. friend the Member for St. Albans, besides a great deal of humour, a genuine ring of anxiety as to the nature of the recruits. That subject is not by any means so interesting or thrilling as the one which the hon. Member for Whitby has drawn across the trail. Still, I think the House will perhaps be interested to know what are the steps which have been taken to redeem the Army from the imputation that inefficients are so largely introduced. In the first place, there is the gravest possible misconception as regards the physique of our Army as compared with that of foreign countries. I cannot discuss this question at any length this afternoon, but I will go as far as this. My hon friend amused the House by assuming an encounter between our troops and those of foreign countries, and referred to the official apology which the Government of the day would have to make—that the foreigners were of so much finer physique.

MR VICARY GIBBS: I never suggested for an instant that the physique of the foreigners was finer than ours. I said that the right hon. Gentleman was allowing a lot of wastrels to be brought into the Army who were not fit to be put into opposition to any other troops that I know.

*MR. BRODRICK: What I understood the hon. Member to say, and I think he will admit that he did say it, was that, as compared with foreign recruits, ours, as at present taken, certainly showed a marked inferiority of physique.

MR. VICARY GIBBS: I said that foreign nations had an immense advantage over us in the fact that they could draw from the whole of their population. I recognised that as a difficulty with which the right hon. Gentleman had to contend. I said that would not help him when it came to a war.

*MR. BRODRICK: That is the point I want to make. My hon. friend thinks that owing to that advantage foreign nations get better recruits. My hon. friend knows, and the House ought to know, that in every single instance—I do not speak of the United States of America—the standard of recruits in foreign countries is lower than it is in this country. Take the standard of French recruits. Nobody who has ever walked through a French garrison town and looked at the soldiers whom he has met will need any statistics. As regards height, there is no standard for infantry soldiers in France. I hold in my hand a book of the French disqualifications. If I had time to read it to them, hon. Members would be astounded at the things which are not regarded as disqualifications, even in men who are under five feet in height. As to German recruits, the minimum height for infantry, telegraph corps, and rifles is 5·05 feet—that is under five feet one inch; and no rules are laid down regarding chest measurement, the matter being left to the medical officers.

In Russia the minimum standard for infantry is five feet one-quarter inch, for rifles five feet one and a quarter inches, and the minimum chest measurement is half the height plus seven-eighths inches. In all those armies I am quite convinced hon. Members will find that in all respects, except that of age, men are taken as physically inferior as any recruits taken in this country. I fully recognise that there is and has been a tendency perhaps in the last fifteen years to go lower in the physical standard of recruits. Why is that? Hon. Members are under the impression, I think, that that is done under civilian pressure in order to produce a larger number on paper. I can assure the House that is not the fact. During my experience at the War Office, which extends back to 1886, with, of course, intervals, I never remember a discussion of this kind in which the military Members did not press for a lower standard or for the introduction of specials, and in which, on the whole, the civilian opinion was not the other way. Why is that? The reason is very obvious. In the Navy they have the great advantage of enlisting boys for boy service. In the Army that is only done to a limited extent. I believe every military man and every naval man prefers taking a recruit as a boy to taking him when he has reached eighteen years of age. Such an one is far better trained, he is far more amenable to discipline, and he learns his business and becomes a soldier or sailor of the best class. To take boys on a very large scale in the Army would be an enormous expense. You would have to spend practically all you are spending now for grown men, and you would also have to spend money on your boy establishment. Therefore, almost every soldier I have come across goes as near as he can and says—Let us take all the grown men we can get and any man who is a little under the standard who is likely to come up to it, because that man will be well trained by the time we want to use him. That may or may not be right, but it has not been concealed from the House of Commons.

When I came forward to urge the House to accept, as I have twice done in the last seven years, an increase of pay, on the first occasion I explained to the House that the pay of a recruit on joining was practically 7d a day—that is to say, there was a messing allowance of 3d which he paid and there were various necessaries for which there were stoppages of 2d., making up the shilling. I told the House then that, recognising that many of these boys were not fit immediately to be put into the field, we could not give the increased allowance of 3d. at that time, and we have since not allowed the increased allowance of 5d., making up the shilling, to be given until one of two things has happened—until a boy or recruit is pronounced to be efficiently trained, which may be after six months' training, or until he has reached nineteen years of age; and that is the rule. Therefore my hon. friend is in error when he says that we pay the same for boys who are inefficient, and specials who have not reached the standard, as we pay for the trained soldier. For specials or weedy boys we pay 7d., and not until they become trained soldiers or are over nineteen do they receive a shilling.

MR. VICARY GIBBS: But if he is kicked out of the Army in six months, he has surely during that time cost as much as the best men?

*MR. BRODRICK: That is another point. I am coming to that. It is true we take a certain number under standard, but we treat them as boys and do not count them as fit or eligible to go abroad. This may be wrong or not, but there has never been any concealment about it. Now what is our position? Of the recruits we have taken a certain percentage under standard. During the war, every man who presented himself was naturally taken and drilled, because he might become useful before the end of the war, and it would have been unwise to refuse him; but the moment I learned the condition of recruiting at the beginning of the year, within two days of receiving the Adjutant-General's Report, we did raise the standard, and I have gone into the whole subject of recruiting and its conditions. My hon. friend, in his enumeration of qualifications, mentioned character, intelligence, and, in the third place, physical vigour. Well, I think physical vigour comes very high in the qualifications for a soldier, but, at any rate, it is one of the characteristics we cannot do without. When we come to the question of character, I find much in what my hon. friend said with which I can agree; but we must remember there are variations in the term character, and in these variations we must not press the question too far. We shall all agree in saying, let us have a system that shall keep out men who have been in gaol for criminal offences, let us have a system that will keep out the habitual drunkard and the man likely to demoralise his comrades. But what I demur to is the laying down of a number of Sunday School rules as to character. You must not lay down a rule under which a boy who has, say, kicked up his heels, and, perhaps, been impertinent to his master, or something of that kind, would be without a character; or a man may have left two or three situations without any cause except such as would prevent one giving a character to a butler or a servant; I do not want such a man to be debarred from Army service on the ground of character. While on this subject perhaps the House will allow me to give a few extracts taken at random from reports I have received from five or six districts in reference to recruits taken last year. In the London district, where I think 8,000 men were taken, the recruiting officer reports that the recruits are more satisfactory now that greater care is taken to make inquiries as to age and character. From Dover the report says there is a marked improvement in the average of education, and characters, when applied for, have invariably been got. In the western district—from Devonport—the reports say the forms in reference to character are filled in in a satisfactory manner. From Warrington it is stated that no recruit is taken who cannot produce a reference or is not known to the recruiter, with the result that there is an absence of fraudulent enlistment. In Birmingham the physique is fairly good, education very good, and character good, owing to the complete system of inquiry. I only take these as typical instances of what we are doing, and I think the House will see they do not show there is that indifference to character of which something has been said. What I propose to do, with the full consent of the Commander-in-Chief, is to cause reference to character to be asked for in each case, and I propose in fact to put in force the system which has been carried out in four of these five districts. Of course, it must be understood that we, in estimating character, must be guided by the conditions and circumstances, but the hon. Member may rest assured that personally I am heartily in accord with his view.

If hon. Members really believe that any occupant of this Bench has any advantage to gain by making a sham statement showing a total of men, a considerable number of whom will fall out before the close of the year, I can assure them they are very greatly mistaken. Where will be the test? What does it matter what happens to-day or to-morrow? The test is the state of the Army two or three years hence. I only wish that those who now so strongly criticise the Government would remember that the present system of Army enlistment is not a year old, and that the results they so vehemently challenge have actually not had the trial of twelve months. It is entirely a delusion to suppose that if, by discarding waste, you get less than 50,000, therefore you necessarily reduce the number of troops you desire to maintain. If you waste less you want less; you gain if you get a lesser number on whom you can rely. That is why I say I am heartily in favour of the principle of the proposal put forward. I make no prophecy in this matter. I have never, in any circumstances, ventured to tell the House we could lay down any fixed rule as to the number of men we could get in a year. As everybody knows, recruiting must largely depend on the state of the labour market, and the pay and prospects offered by the Army. But I do believe—although we cannot control the state of the labour market—I do believe that a great step forward has been taken, not only in the pay, but in the improvements of the prospects in the Army in the last few years; and I believe that anything that will tend to advance that step, that any system improving the condition of our troops, will induce men who have not hitherto joined the Army to come to it as an honourable profession in which they will be adequately remunerated. I hope, in that my hon. friends and the Government are not far apart in their views, that they will not think it necessary to divide on this Motion for a reduction, which I understand has been put forward to give them the opportunity of expressing the strong feelings they hold, and in which, so far as I can see, we are in almost entire accord.

MR. H. BROADHURST (Leicester) said he wished to speak on the subject from the point of view of the taxpayer. He was entirely in favour of the Motion of the hon. Gentleman. He voted for the reduction of the Army last week, and he would vote for a still greater reduction if a division were taken on the Motion. He had a firm conviction that the burden which was being imposed on the taxpayers for the defensive forces of the country was becoming intolerable, and that the country was becoming tired of it. They could not view the increase in the forces of the country without considering their future position. Hon. Members opposite appeared to live in an atmosphere which was three years old. Every part of the country that had had an opportunity of expressing an opinion on the present policy of the Government had rejected it. That was seen last week, and again yesterday in one of the strongholds of the Conservative Party; and probably within a week it would be seen in another Conservative stronghold. He understood that hon. Gentlemen opposite introduced these discussions on the Army, firstly, because they thought the Army was unnecessarily large, and therefore necessarily expensive; and, secondly, because they thought the country was not getting value for the money expended. Their contention was that it would be better to have a small, thoroughly-equipped and effective Army, then a larger Army not equipped and not efficient. He understood hon. Members to say that the strength of the Army as shown by the Secretary of State was a paper strength; and that the War Office was drawing recruits to such an extent that they were compelled to take men and boys who otherwise would be rejected. There was a great change in the position imposed on recruits since his time. Forty-five years ago he submitted himself to the consideration of a recruiting officer. He had a little refreshment within him, and was inspired with great hopes and expectations as to his military prospects as he marched through the streets to the barracks. However, he was not even permitted to reach the medical officer's department. He was immediately stripped of his boots, put under a measure, and declared short, and so ended his connection with the British Army. He could only speak of the Army up to that point, and no further. He was not a wastrel physically, whatever else he might have been. For the last forty-five years he had been in pretty good health, but the standard for the British Army in that time had been so reduced that they now took mere shadows of humanity compared with what he was then. That was the one weak point of this system, and that was the point to which hon. Members opposite had drawn attention. They showed that we were hanging on a broken reed; that we were taking recruits unfit to bear arms, and training them for six or twelve months at a great cost, and at last they had to be rejected as utterly useless as a fighting force.

The right hon. Gentleman had stated that in the last two or three years he had come down to the House with Motions for improving the Army by giving an increase of pay. But he would not improve the Army by increasing the pay alone. That no doubt was necessary, but they would also have to improve the condition of life in barracks, and increase the self-respect of the rank and file of the Army; they must also be able to hold out to the private soldier a moderate course of promotion, and do away with much of that hateful and detestable class distinction which now ruled so much in the British Army. If something of that kind were done, a great deal would be done for the recruiting of the British Army, and they would obtain the best persons available. Another difficulty which they had to contend with was the decrease in the physique of the class to which they had to go for the rank and file. That was a very serious matter, and so long as the agricultural labourers of this country, from which the great majority of our recruits were drawn, were decreasing, and the conditions under which they lived were so demoralising to their physique and morality, that difficulty would remain. He had thought it necessary to inform the House of his slight connection with the Army, and, speaking for himself, if he were an officer, he would rather go with 100 strong and true men, who were intelligent and physically fit to meet the most extreme strain that might be put upon them, than he would with 150 half-breeds who were physically and mentally unfit for any undertaking. He trusted that the hon. Member for St. Albans would divide the House upon this point, in which case he would vote with him. They must reduce. They could not go on in this ridiculous way, spending millions and millions on both services, and yet having no guarantee that with this inceased expenditure they had increased safety. If they were to have a real War Office reform they should get rid of the old, useless, ineffective administrators, and place in their positions men who would be capable of giving twenty shillings worth of value for every pound which was spent. They did not grumble so much at the amount as the fact that they felt the money was being wasted and the country was not getting value for it. That was one of the main reasons why they continually opposed this increasing outlay of public money. Real reform must start at the bottom and continue to the top, and anyone who was inefficient, who came between them and the object they had in view, must give place to others. He supported the reduction.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) pointed out that the Government must have Vote I and Vote A before half-past seven. He only rose to call the attention of the House to the fact, and hoped hon. Gentlemen would bear it in mind.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham) said he had no intention of making a speech, but that after the statement made by the Secretary of State for War he thought it was only right that he should express his thanks to the right hon. Gentleman for the announcement he had made with reference to the new system of enlisting recruits. He had taken great interest in this matter, and had brought it to the attention of the House on several occasions in past years, and it was a matter of great satisfaction to him that the right hon. Gentleman should be willing to try this new system, at any rate as an experiment. The right hon. Gentleman had said that he accepted the principle of the hon. Member for St. Albans' Amendment, and further that he was "heart and soul with him." That was a statement the House had heard with great satisfaction, and it showed that the right hon. Gentleman was not impervious to argument.

One other word by way of personal explanation. The hon. Member for Durham had vigorously attacked those who had placed on the Paper Motions for reduction, on the ground that their only motive was to reduce the fighting strength of the Army, otherwise, he said, they should have stated in their Motion the motives of their reduction. He would point out to his hon friend, however, that by the Rules of the House it was not possible to show on the Paper the motives with which a reduction was to be moved. Personally he had handed in a notice to reduce the strength of the Army by a certain number, "being the number of ineffectives now in the ranks," but the clerks had ruled it out. Whatever hon. Members might think, he could assure them that, as far as he was concerned, his motive was to reduce the strength of the Army not by a single fighting man, but only by the number of ineffectives. In conclusion, he wished to express the confident belief that the reforms which the Secretary of State for War had just announced would prove very successful in practice, and would have a most beneficial effect, not only upon recruiting, but upon the Army generally.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion), in supporting the Amendment, said that while he agreed with almost every word of the mover, he did not confine his opposition to the Vote to the grounds stated by the hon. Member. His main objection was that the total war expenditure of the country, on a peace footing, was monstrously extravagant, and ought to be reduced. His reading of recent elections was that a great revulsion of feeling was taking place in the country on the question of expenditure, and that there would have to be a return to methods of economy. The enormous increase of war expenditure in the last ten years was due to the great change of policy involved in the revival of Imperialism, which had taken place since the retirement of Mr. Gladstone. In the year following that statesman's retirement, there was an increase of several millions in the war services, and that increase had been going on by leaps and bounds ever since. But would anybody suggest that the country had been freer from apprehension of attack? The reverse was the case. The confidence of foreign countries in Mr. Gladstone and his policy of peace, which Liberals of former days, and real Liberals of to-day, advocated, had secured the country from apprehension of attack. That policy had been changed, and with it the attitude of other countries had altered. The alternative policy he would suggest was a return to the old traditions, which had been the policy as much of Conservatives as of Liberals. Hon. Members on the other side would not be abandoning the old traditions of Conservatism by adopting the policy of retrenchment and economy, and particularly of minding our own affairs, and not seizing the property of other people.

The hon. Member for Durham had suggested the possibility of our Army having o face Continental armies in an European war. He demurred altogether to that view. Even if we raised as many men as the most extravagant Member on the other side desired, it would be as a mere drop in the ocean compared with the armies on the Continent; while if our Navy were defeated, and this country invaded, we should not be on the "safe side," to use the hon. Member's words, if we had three times as many men as we have. If we were to prepare against invasion, we were woefully below the necessary number, while if we simply desired to guard our possessions in other countries, our Army was a great deal too large. He agreed with what had been said as to the class of men required in the Army, and that was one of his reasons for thinking a reduction necessary. The proper class of men could not be obtained unless higher pay was offered, and, as the country would not dream of voting more money than was now being voted, the only way to enable better pay to be given was to reduce the number of men. He should certainly support the Amendment, and he only wished it had been proposed to reduce the Vote by a much larger number of men.

LORD HUGH CECIL said that perhaps he might be permitted to say that when he interrupted his right hon. friend it was not on the point of Order. He was annoyed by what appeared to be the very great discourtesy of his observations [Cries of "Oh" and "No"]—he was entitled to his opinion of them—and he really did not see any inherent absurdity in challenging his right hon. friend upon amenity of manners. He was better pleased, however, to deal with the main part of his right hon. friend's speech, which was of a very satisfactory character. He quite agreed with his hon. friend that what had been said by the last two speakers was not so relevant to this matter as to a previous occasion. But to avoid misapprehension, he was obliged to say that his hon. friend the Member for Durham, whom they always listened to with interest and instruction, really misapprehended the case with which he dealt. They did not desire in the slightest degree to alter or destroy the military character of the Empire. They did not propose that there should never be in the future, as there had been in the past, military operations where necessary. They did not in the slightest degree deny the importance of the Indian Empire or the necessity of defending the Indian Empire. All these were objects of national policy on which there was substantial agreement on both sides of the House. The whole question that had been debated in these discussions was whether the Army, under his right hon. friend's scheme, was an instrument well suited to the needs of the country, or could it not be made much better suited to the needs of the country at a much smaller cost, and, in that case, should they not gain in military efficiency and still more in national economy by reducing it. To that opinion he adhered, and his hon. friends adhered, and they did not find their opinions in the least changed either by the imputation of motives, or the appeal to military authorities in lieu of arguments to which the Government had had recourse. They continued to believe, and they would continue to believe, that his right hon. friend's scheme was a bad one; but they had, he confessed, received very great encouragement that afternoon, because, for the first time in these debates, the Government had been inspired by a spirit of sweet reasonableness, excepting his right hon. friend's exordium, and had given assurances which were of a most satisfactory character. The only criticism he would make on that part of the speech was that he wished his right hon. friend had said something more about the age of the recruits. But, on the whole, he thought his hon. friend the Member for St. Albans might congratulate himself on having drawn from the Government declarations of a highly satisfactory character. He hoped this might be the swallow of a summer of reason, and that, in other respects also, the Government might be able to meet the views of their critics—views which, he might be permitted to assure his right hon. friend, were founded on conviction and defended by argument. He hoped the Government would meet the views of their critics, and thus avoid a recurrence of these extremely critical debates.

*Mr. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe) said he desired to dissociate himself from the opinion that this country in the event of anything happening to the Fleet would be left entirely unprotected. It was time some protest was made against the impression that in the event of war, and in the event of our Fleet being defeated, this country would have to surrender because they would be unable to defend themselves. He thought such an exhibition of cowardice would be unworthy of the great nation and the great Empire they had inherited. He thought they might rely upon the Auxiliary forces for the defence of this country. He knew from his own experience how much had been done at a small expense with regard to the Yeomanry in which he had the honour of serving. By the addition of about £300,000 to the national expenditure, the Yeomanry had been increased to something like 35,000 men, and he thought more might be done to increase their defensive forces by encouraging the Volunteers. It was in that direction, and not in the direction of a great increase in the standing Army, that they ought to look for insuring the safety of this country. On those grounds he should support the proposal for a reduction. He only wished to add one word about India. He well remembered how the whole question was threshed out years ago when a very wise statesman, the late Lord Derby, said that the true defences of India were a contented people and a well-filled Treasury, an Army not too widely scattered for its work, and neighbours who are satisfied that we have no designs on their independence or their territory. The safety of India was secured very much by their good relations with Afghanistan, a country which constituted a most ideal buffer state, because it was inhabited by tribes who would not permit an armed force to come within their borders, and it was a country so difficult that the Duke of Wellington once said that in it a small army would be annihilated, and a large army would starve. He believed that in India they were safe enough, and in this country they had Auxiliary forces sufficient to defend these shores. He was in favour of maintaining a small and well-trained Army with proper reserves, and he should cordially support the proposition before the House.

Mr. VICARY GIBBS said that with the leave of the House he would withdraw his Motion. He desired to thank the Secretary of State for War for the way in which he had received his arguments, appreciated his motives, and acceded to his desires.

Mr. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): It is almost presumption for an outsider, who watches these little domestic jars with pain, but not with a wholly unsympathetic interest, to intervene at all on an occasion of this kind, particularly at a moment when there seems to be a prospect of a temporary reconciliation. My sole object in rising is to say this: I understand that the object of the hon. Gentleman in the Motion he has brought forward is to deal entirely with the question of recruiting. The reduction which he proposes is very much less than those who were opposed to the whole scheme would be prepared to vote for; and it is because of the limitation suggested by the figures of the hon. Gentleman, and borne out by the arguments of his speech, that some of us who would otherwise have taken part in the discussion have not been able to do so. The hon. Gentleman, I think, has very good reason for congratulating himself upon the response he has received to his Motion. Similar points were made in a speech of very great ability, marked by wide and minute knowledge, by the hon. Member for Fareham, who did not on that occasion get anything like the same amount of satisfaction from the responsible Minister as has been conceded to-day. It is well worth while to have spent some hours of the time of the House of Commons in inducing the Secretary of State to make the admission he has made to-day, and to give the undertakings, which I am sure will be carried out to the best of the right hon. Gentleman's ability, and which we hope will result in putting a very different complexion on the whole of this question. I, for my part, am not prepared to stand in the way of the withdrawal of the Motion.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said he believed the right hon. Gentleman had made an omission which, more than anything else, would have satisfied everybody upon this recruiting question. He wished the right hon. Gentleman to give a pledge that when making inquiries as to character, he would also include inquiries as to age. This would not require any expert correspondence, and it would be just as simple to do this as to inquire about character.

*Mr. BRODRICK: I have over and over again endeavoured to secure some proof of age. I am told that a very large number of recruits do not know where they were born, and it is useless to ask them to prove their age. All I can do in such cases is to give instructions that the medical officers shall be very particular with the men about whom they have any doubts and see that they have the physical appearance and development of eighteen years.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER said that all he wished for was that when inquiry was made as to character inquiries should be made as to age at the same time. He knew there were difficulties in some cases, but in many cases it would be very simple to get the age as well.

Sir JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) said that as far as his experience went there was very little difficulty in ascertaining age in order to meet the requirements of the Factory Acts. Factory owners were bound to know whether boys were over fourteen or not, and whether they were eighteen or under. When the right hon. Gentleman became strict in inquiring into character he would find that boys of good character knew their age. It was only boys who did not know where they were born who did not know their age. He hoped the right hon Gentleman would make inquiry about age, and not simply trust to the report of the doctor.

*Mr. BRODRICK: At present inquiry is made into age, but in a great number of cases it is very difficult to get. I am quite certain that if every Member of this House were asked to go into the Vote Office and to write down at once where he was born and where his birth certificate could be obtained the great majority would not be able to do so.

Question put.

House divided:—Ayes, 246; Noes, 73.—(Division List No. 36.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (*Walworth*)

Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (*Manch'r*)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (*Hornsey*
Balfour, RtHnGerald W. (*Leeds*
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Fras. T. (*Windsor*)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benj.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bowles, T. G. (*Lynn Regis*)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alx. H. (*Shropsh.*)
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn J A (*Glasg.*)
Campbell, J. H. M. (*Dublin Univ*
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (*Derbyshire*
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (*Aston Manor*)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (*Greenwich*)
Chamberlain, Rt Hon J (*Birm*
Chamberlain, RtHn J. A. (*Worc.*
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Cox, Irwin Edwd. Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, H. Shepherd (*Bolton*)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Jos. C.
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A Akers
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, E. B. (*Hants, W.*)
Faber, George Denison (*York*)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (*Man'r*
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest

Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (*St. Albans*
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Gordon, Maj Evans- (*Tr. Hmlts*
Gore, HnG. R. C Ormsby- (*Salop*
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (*Linc*
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E. W. (*Bury St. Ed.*
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, RtHnLordG. (*Mid'x*
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, James (*Staff's., N. W.*)
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (*Sheff., B'tside*)
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Jno (*Kent, Faver'hm*
Howard, J. (*Midd., Tott'ham*
Hozier, Hon. Jas. Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (*Salop*
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (*Glasgow*
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (*Evesham*
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (*Bristol, S*
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (*Lowestoft*
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (*Liverpool*)
M'Killop, James (*Stirlingshire*)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Mitchell, William
Molesworth, Sir Lewis

Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (*Shropshire*
Morgan, D. J. (*Walthamstow*)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, RtHn. A. Graham (*Bute*
Murray, Col. Wyndham (*Bath*)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (*Salisbury*)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn. Wm. R. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. F. (*Bethnal Green*)
Rigg, Richard
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (*Sheffield*)
Robertson, Herbert (*Hackney*)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose, Charles Day
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (*Liverpool*)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Saml. Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (*Marylebone, W.*)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (*Isle of Wight*
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (*Renfrew*
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (*Romford*)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (*Hertford, E.*)
Smith, Jas Parker (*Lanarks*)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (*W. Bromwich*)
Stanley, Hon. A. (*Ormskirk*)
Stanley, Edward J. (*Somerset*)
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir Jn. M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (*Chichester*)
Taylor, Austin (*East Toxteth*)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent Col. Sir C. E. H. *Sheffi'd*
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.

Webb, Col. William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. *Taunton*
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (*Notts*)
Whiteley, H. (*Ashton-u.-Lyne*)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(*Birm*
Williams, Colonel R. (*Dorset*)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. S. (*York, E. R.*)
Wilson, John (*Glasgow*)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (*Yorks.*)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn E. R. (*Bath*)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)
Allen, Chas. P. (*Glos., Stroud*)
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (*Derbyshire*)
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Craig, Robert Hunter (*Lanark*)
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (*Carmarthen*)
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hardie, J. Keir (*Merthyr Tyd*
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt Hon Sir Arthur D.
Hope John Deans (*Fife, West*
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Wm. (*Carnarvonshire*)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer, Sir Charles M (*Durham*
Partington, Oswald
Priestley, Arthur
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (*Dumfries*
Roberts, John Bryn (*Eifion*)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, S. M. (*Whitechapel*)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles E. (*Stafford*)
Sinclair, John (*Forfarshire*)
Smith, Samuel (*Flint*)
Soares, Ernest J.
Thomas, Sir A. (*Glamorgan, E.*)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John L. (*Leeds, S.*)
Walton, Joseph (*Barnsley*)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (*Clackmannan*
White, George (*Norfolk*)
White, Luke (*York, E.R.*)
Whiteley, George (*York, W.R.*)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, F. W. (*Norfolk, Mid*)
Wilson, H. J. (*York, W. R.*)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (*Huddr'sf'd*

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Labouchere and Mr. J. H. Whitley.

Resolution agreed to.

SUPPLY [12th MARCH, AFTERNOON SITTING] REPORT.

Resolution reported.

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1903-4.

"That a sum, not exceeding £9,647,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Pay, Allowances, and other Charges of His Majesty's Army at Home and Abroad (exclusive of India) (General Staff, Regiments, Reserve, and Departments,) which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, West) said he wished to draw the attention of the House to the question of the status of the officers of the Army Veterinary Department, to the insufficiency of their pay, and to limitation of their prospective career in the Army. This subject had been repeatedly raised by himself before the war, and even that very day, by a question to the Secretary of State for War. The fact was that so great was the discontent of veterinarians that the Department was unable to obtain the requisite number of officers, and at present there were thirty vacancies without candidates. It would be in the recollection of hon. Members that during the late war, in consequence of the dearth of veterinary officers, vessels carrying horses to South Africa were despatched without veterinary surgeons on board, with the result that a large proportion of the horses were lost in the course of the voyage; and when the remainder were landed in South Africa they were rushed up country in an absolutely unprepared state for active work in the Field. In fact, millions had had to be paid in consequence of this special Department not being sufficiently staffed. He insisted that the Secretary for War should so improve the position of the veterinary surgeons in the Army, more especially by granting combatant rank, better pay, and a retiring allowance after so many years of service, that competent candidates would be induced to offer their services. Promises, to the effect that this question would be investigated, had been made before the war broke out, but the investigation was delayed. Now that the war was over he was given to understand that a Committee was sitting considering the matter, and he thought that this was a suitable opportunity for the right hon. Gentleman to state what he had been able to do in regard to it.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said that he had expected that day to see hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side of the House moving the reduction of the Vote which had been put down on the Paper referring to the question of Army Corps, so as to press their views as to getting a more effective Army than now existed, and at less cost. He could not see this Vote passed without making a protest against the extravagant system introduced by the Secretary for War, and against the enormous numbers of the existing Army. Personally, he did not object to a large Army, but he believed the country could not and would not spend the money they were now asked to spend on the Army. The strong reaction against this extravagance, shown from day to day, was increasing; and the wave of feeling against that increased expenditure was so great that hon. Members who laughed would not be there to laugh again. The reaction, he believed, would be a source of real danger to the country. He would not move a reduction of the Vote, because the last time he had done so he had been told that it was too large, although he thought it very modest; but a reduction there ought to be, although he saw no attempt on the part of the War Office to make it in any department of the Army, which, he felt sure, would not only endanger the position of the Secretary for War and his friends, but the efficiency of the Army as well as of the Navy.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W. R., Pudsey) said he wished to direct attention to an item in the Vote which the Committee had not had an opportunity of discussing. He referred to the item of £90,000 for the pay of the China Expeditionary Force. Last year £50,000 had been voted for that purpose, and he could not understand how so large a sum as £90,000 could be demanded for the pay of that Expeditionary Force in the next financial year. They knew that, unfortunately, China was in a very disturbed condition, and he would like to know how many British troops were there now, and for what purpose this £90,000 was required. It was rather a strong order that they should be asked to pass such a huge sum for a purpose of which they knew nothing, and he hoped the representative of the War Office would be able to give some satisfactory explanation of it. If not, he would be compelled to move the reduction of the Vote.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton) said that the hon. and gallant Member for Newington West had practically asked the Secretary for War to prejudge a case which had been referred to a Committee which was now sitting. It was quite recognised that there was a shortage of candidates for the Veterinary Department of the Army, and that there was a difficulty in obtaining a proper supply of veterinary surgeons; but that matter would be dealt with by the Secretary for War as soon as the Report of the Committee was presented to him.

With regard to the China Expedition, the reason for the increase was that it was rather a difficult matter to arrange all the accounts with India. India paid the money, and the British Government had now to repay India. Some of the accounts which were not rendered last year had now been rendered. The China Expeditionary Force was a remnant of the force that went out in 1900, and on y a sufficient number of troops were left as were considered to be necessary to guard our interests in China.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) asked, on a point of order, whether it was in order to pay in the next financial year expenses which had been incurred during the present year; and whether they should not have been met by a Supplementary Estimate.

*MR. SPEAKER: The matter is quite in order, as I understand the noble

Lord to say that the sum will only become payable to India in the course of the next financial year.

*Mr. BUCHANAN said that a Paper had been circulated that morning containing a restatement of the figures with reference to the Army, and an appendix was inserted which hitherto had always been inserted in the Army Estimates. He would ask why these important statements had not been included in the Army Estimates when issued. Then there was another important appendix generally inserted in the Estimates showing the sums of money which were expended on military services in the Colonies and Egypt. That had been omitted this year, and he could not think why, as it was of the greatest importance that they should know from year to year what the military expenditure out of Estimates was in the various Colonies and Egypt.

Mr. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said he wished to protest against the great increase in the General Staff. The Army Corps were still in a more or less nebulous condition. The men had not yet been obtained, and he should like to know whether they were going to pay officers to command these Army Corps when they had no men to command. The figures were rather serious. Exclusive of all charges for South Africa he found that the General Staff in 1901–2 was 279, and that their pay and allowances were £160,000. In 1902–3 the number increased to 338, and the pay and allowances to £194,000. For 1903–4 the General Staff was estimated at 381, and the pay and allowances at £222,000. He should like to know what was the reason for such a tremendous increase.

*Mr. BRODRICK said that he thought the hon. Gentleman was not in the House when he made a full statement as to the Staff a few days ago He would point out that the increase in the Staff was not connected with the Army Corps scheme. The House would hardly expect him to repeat his statement; but he might say that in no case had an officer been appointed who had not troops to command. In one or two cases officers had been indicated for command before the troops were enrolled, but they would not be put on pay until they were on active duty. As to the absence of some of the tables, complained of by the hon. Gentleman, he would look into the matter. Some of the tables were rather later than usual this year.

Resolution agreed to.

SUPPLY [12th March Evening Sitting].—REPORT.

Resolution reported.

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

"Thata sum, not exceeding £1,638,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Retired Pay, Half-Pay, and other Non-Effective Charges for Officers, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

Mr. WHITLEY said that when the Vote was in Committee he raised a point with reference to the rewards for meritorious services which appeared in the Vote. The right hon. Gentleman said on that occasion that he had made an alteration in the system of distributing the rewards, and that, whereas they had hitherto been given to officers on full pay, and had ceased when officers retired, in future they would not come into operation until an officer had retired, and they would continue as long as he lived. What he wished to know was, whether officers who obtained rewards under the old system would in future be able to retain them when on retired pay. He rather gathered from what the noble Lord had said that some officers would have it both ways.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER asked how it was that when the Army was demobilised after the war the number of general officers on half-pay, instead of being increased, was reduced. The right hon. Gentleman said that the reason was that officers had not been put on half-pay, but on retired pay. He found, however, that the number of general officers on retired pay had also decreased; and he could not quite understand the matter. The only explanation was that more general officers remained on full pay, but he understood from the right hon. Gentleman that that was not correct.

*MR. BRODRICK said that there were more officers on full pay owing to the forces in South Africa. The number of officers on retired pay was annually decreasing.

CAPTAIN NORTON said he should like an explanation as to why certain officers in the Indian Army were included in this Vote.

*MR. BRODRICK said if the hon. Gentleman would put down a Question, he would explain the matter to him.

Resolution agreed to.

EVENING SITTING.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (WALES AND MONMOUTHSHIRE).

*MR. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon), in calling attention to the question of Welsh local government, said he asked for administrative and legislative devolution applicable to the local needs of Wales, and dealing with its special and peculiar interests. This was no new question. It had been dealt with by both Parties in the House, and he recognised that the demand for local government affected the whole country. The principle of devolution was not a principle which affected Wales alone—it ought to be applied in accordance with the requirements of the different communities concerned. In that, he believed, was to be found the only solution for the congestion which paralysed the efficiency of Imperial Parliament and its administrative action at the present moment. He knew the objection was to giving to Wales a distinct or separate treatment, but they believed that they had clear, genuine, deep-seated differences of local conditions. No one could deny the success which had attended the special treatment accorded to Wales in the matter of education and Sunday closing. The Royal Commission showed that the latter was a success. For twelve years they had had no measure passed for the benefit of Wales exclusively, except three years ago, when a very small Bill was passed with regard to the educational endowment of a single parish, that of Berriew, against the direct vote of the vast majority of the parishioners, and contrary to the expressed wish of the overwhelming majority of the Welsh Members. Wales had its own Church question, its own temperance question, and a special land question. A Commission had sat on the latter subject, but they had not had any Act dealing with it. Why should the doctrine of identity of treatment with regard to England and Wales be insisted upon when both Parties in the House had agreed to deal with Wales separately already? Lord Salisbury had stated that if ever there was a people who had a separate nationality it was the Welsh, and the late Chancellor of the Exchequer had also stated that he recognised that the circumstances of Wales were in some respects peculiar and different from those of England.

They were not asking for an independent or separatist government, but merely for what the Colonial Secretary had said he believed to be just and necessary—beyond a purely municipal organisation—a larger arrangement by which various portions of the United Kingdom should be enabled to exercise greater influence over local administration and legislation for their special needs and requirements. The difficulty was that owing to the tremendous pressure of Imperial business Welsh business got crowded out, just the same as Scottish business; but Parliament, in the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman, might delegate to a local assembly—to local, national or provincial assemblies, such questions as education, public works, local government and Private Bill legislation. The Prime Minister, when Secretary for Scotland, had described the Private Bill legislative system as utterly absurd, expensive and antiquated, and when the Scotch Act was passed it was understood, if successful, the system ought to be extended. Why not apply it to Wales? In his constituency there were small watering-places which had been put to enormous expense to pass Private Bills, and he asked—Why should not that money be spent in Wales? Wales provided a great deal of local legislation. One year it was shown that whereas Wales promoted twenty-five Private Bills Scotland only promoted nine, and yet there was a private legislation procedure for Scotland. Many places desiring improvements in Wales were kept back because of the enormous cost of coming to Westminster. The Welsh County Councils and non county boroughs were unanimously in favour of the transfer of powers under section 10 of the Local Government Act of 1888, but because English non-county boroughs opposed it a proposal to carry it into effect was dropped.

He hoped the President of the Local Government Board would use his influence with the Government to get his Local Government (Transfer of Powers) Bill passed in the present year. By the Bill it is proposed that Section 10 of the Act of 1888 shall be construed so as to authorise the transfer of all or any of the Powers, duties or liabilities mentioned in that section, to the Council of a particular County or County Borough, as well as to such Councils generally. These might include amongst many others, the granting of charters of incorporation and Provisional Orders for tramways, gas, water, and electric light, sanction for loans for purposes of Public Health and other Acts, compulsory purchase of lands, appeals by ratepayers and others. Wales was willing to accept that transfer of powers, but of course that would not signify complete satisfaction and finality in their demands. They contended that in the matter of higher and intermediate education the Welsh Central Board and federated university colleges, Wales had shown not merely its desire, but competence and qualification, for administrative local government. That local government ought to be in the hands of an authority which would represent the whole Welsh nation, for the purpose of developing all its forces and character. It would make for efficiency, and strengthen the most important factors in the Empire which Wales had done so much to build. The Tudor dynasty that mainly founded the Empire and its Navy was a Welsh dynasty. He believed that no people in these realms were more able to administer local government than the Welsh, who had been disciplined in the best school — the school of religious institutions. What he asked for was self-government all round and Imperial government round all. On this basis and according to this principle they asked for a measure of self-government that would satisfy loyal and patriotic Wales.

*SIR ALFRED THOMAS (Glamorganshire, E.) said that he associated himself with his hon. friend the Member for Arfon, and endorsed all he had advanced in favour of his Motion. Some twelve years ago he had introduced a Bill into the House entitled, "The Welsh National Institutions Bill," in which he had proposed a devolution of administration, and the setting up of new institutions. One of the most important of them had been established for some time, namely, the University of Wales, and another, viz., a Welsh National Museum, would soon be in course of construction. When he introduced that Bill, such institutions appeared to be quite beyond the legislative horizon, especially the University, but those institutions, and such important items of legislation as the Intermediate Education Act, passed since then, encourage them to hope that the present Government might — especially in the way of devolution—do much to facilitate the administration of Local Government, and to lessen the congestion now existing in several of the great Departments. They hoped that the President of the Local Government Board would be able to tell them that he contemplated the setting up of a united council representing the County and County Borough Councils in Wales and Monmouthshire. There was not another Department in which the work had so much increased as that of the Local Government Board, and while he often felt that the public interest suffered from the congestion of business, he always appreciated the efforts of the staff to do all in their power to meet the demands of local bodies. The work of this Department could not be estimated simply by the increase in the population, for the volume of business increased by leaps and bounds. He believed that it would be beneficial if much of the work carried on by the Home Office was directed from a central office in the Principality.

With regard to Elementary and Intermediate education, the Board of Education could relieve itself of the work of inspection and examination, which could be carried out by the Welsh Board. Then with regard to private Bills, the experiment that had been proved so successful in regard to Scotland could be extended to Wales. They knew that the charges imposed upon the promoters of private Bills were so excessive as to be a positive scandal. He knew of enterprises projected by people of small means, whose capital account was increased 50 per cent. by the exorbitant charges made upon them before they could carry even an unopposed Bill through Parliament. And the case was equally hard upon those who opposed any proposed legislation. A District Council in his division found itself called upon to oppose the passing of a Bill by a private company, which sought to impose higher scales of charges for the supply of water than the District Council were charging for water they supplied from their reservoirs. They determined to oppose, and, doing so, had to pay a sum that equalled a rate of two shillings in the pound. If they had to appear before such a tribunal as that set up in Edinburgh, it would not have been necessary to spend a tenth of that sum. He believed that there should be a Minister whose duty it would be to administer Welsh affairs, and to transact such duties as those performed by the Secretary for Scotland.

But while they might not expect anything of heroic dimensions from the present Government, they had given precedents of greater reform than those already mentioned. Wales has always believed that the County Councils deserve much wider powers than they now possess. The admirable manner in which they have administered such limited powers as those now entrusted to them abundantly testifies to their fitness to carry out legislative and administrative duties of a much more important and responsible character. And whatever can be said for them individually, much more could be said for a group of Councils representing all Wales and Monmouthshire. One part of the country would be a check upon the other, and would take care that no portion of the country should overrun the constable at the expense of the remainder. Had a more progressive Government been in power, their demands would have increased in a like ratio; but what he had sketched in the very modest proposals he had just made were well within the power of the present Government to put into practice, and he believed, modest as they were, they would do much to facilitate public work in the Principality.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is desirable to grant self-government in local affairs to Wales, subject to the supreme authority of the Imperial Parliament."—(*Mr. William Jones.*)

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL **PRYCE JONES** (Montgomery Boroughs) said he found no reason to change his mind in regard to this matter. It was quite true with regard to the Welsh University that the Government, quite apart from politics, had treated Wales generously, and they were doing something to support a Welsh museum, but these were matters upon which Members of the House from Wales were agreed, and that made a substantial difference. It was no argument, though, that they agreed to a Motion with regard to self-government, and he believed the hon. Members oppposite were mistaken in asking the House to grant that. The adoption of the policy embodied in the Resolution meant the setting up of a separate department dealing with self-government in Wales. That he did not think would be fair to Wales itself, because it would put in the hands of the County Councils all the minor authorities, and it was well known that the County Councils represented mainly the territorial and aristocratic interest. This was a parochial resolution, not worthy of the House of Commons or of the Imperial Parliament. On the previous day he attended a meeting of the Montgomeryshire County Council. They were engaged in appointing Committees, and when a proposal was made for the election of a Small Holdings Committee, an hon. member asked why they should take that course. The reply was, "Because the Act of Parliament says we must." Then he himself asked, "Why do not the Montgomery County Council put the Act in force?" and he took the opportunity to state his well-known views on these questions. He inquired what was the use of them asking

Parliament to confer further powers on them when they failed to take advantage of those they already possessed. They were doing nothing in regard to small holdings, allotments, isolation hospitals and inebriates' homes, yet his hon. friend opposite was now asking Parliament to confer powers which Wales had never demanded. Until the County Councils in Wales had met together and agreed to appeal to Parliament for these powers they ought not to waste the time of Parliament in this way. Some of the powers now being asked for they already possessed under the Act of 1888. He might be told that they had no power to spend money. But that was not the fact. They could spend money out of the rates for legitimate purposes on matters in which the County Councils were jointly interested. In debating resolutions such as this under these circumstances, therefore, they were simply ploughing the sands.

*MR. EDWARDS (Radnorshire) said he was sorry they were not to have the support of so ardent a patriot as the hon. Member; but he thought a little conversation with so strong a Welsh patriot would easily break down the barrier that kept him from joining them. He congratulated the Government on the fact that his hon. friend had cast his ægis over them and had sought to guide them in some of their counsels. No doubt they would be grateful. As he understood him the hon. Member took exception to the Motion because, as he said, the County Councils had power to do what was desired now. That was not the case, and a Bill had to be brought in to give the County Councils the powers which they were asking for. The hon. Member's memory must be very short if he did not remember that a deputation waited upon the President of the Local Government Board last year to ask for further powers.

LIEUT.-COLONEL PRYCE-JONES: Really, I am bound to correct the hon. Member. With regard to that conference, the County Councils in Wales had not been consulted beforehand. I pointed that out in the debate last year.

*MR. FRANK EDWARDS said he would not argue with the hon. Member, because he had personal knowledge of the fact that the County Councils were aware of the Motion to be submitted, and his hon. friend was quite wrong when he said that the County Councils could combine now. The Welsh County Councils did try to work together and combine for the good of Wales, but they failed to do so because they had not got the power to spend the money that would be required. There were two things which struck one with regard to powers given to local institutions. One was the degree to which such powers had been extended in recent years under the Acts of 1888, 1894, and other Acts, and side by side with that there was the fact to be noted of the extraordinary limitations which had been placed by the timidity of Parliament on the local institutions which it had called into existence. Some of these might be necessary, but he was bound to say that many of them were quite unnecessary. The other day he read in a Welsh paper that a Welsh District Council was advertising for a Sanitary Inspector. He was to receive the magnificent sum of £8 per annum, and the advertisement stated that the appointment was to be subject to the approval of the Local Government Board. Surely that was one of the powers that could very well be left to the County Councils. The County Councils had now existed for something like fourteen years, and although they had been in existence so long, it was only now that a responsible Minister of the Crown brought in a Bill to give them power to promote measures of their own, etc. This should have been the case from the beginning. The fact was the County Councils had been hampered and hindered by Government Departments in matters which might very well have been left to the localities themselves. There was no doubt that if they had left them for the localities to deal with in their own way they would have been settled far more speedily and satisfactorily.

The result of the present arrangements had been unnecessary delay, unnecessary expense, and unnecessary irritation on the part of the localities concerned. It was no wonder there had been delay when they remembered that there were thousands of local authorities which must be in constant communication with the authorities at Whitehall. Efficient local Government, he maintained, must depend on perfect knowledge of the local circumstances. Local people had that knowledge, but that was not so with the clerks at Whitehall. The Government must either increase the number of the officials at Whitehall, which meant increasing the number of those who hindered the action of the local authorities; or they must increase the powers of the local authorities, making them more worth sitting upon. If they did that they would get a better class of men to take an interest in public work. He was sorry that the fortune of the ballot had prevented him bringing in a Bill to grant powers of combination to the County Councils, because that Bill would have gone to the root of the whole matter. Its object was to grant powers not only to individual County Councils, but also powers for combination by groups of Councils, which was a thing he saw no sign of getting yet, but which was very necessary if they were to do any good in this matter of extending the power of local bodies. It seemed to be a wise thing to make an experiment of this kind in Wales, because the geographical position of Wales was such that the experiment could be safely made there without injury to England. But it had been urged that it was not a wise thing to give these powers particularly to the Welsh County Councils, because they were most of them of one political colour. He supposed that if they were of a different colour, politically speaking, these powers might safely be given. That was a serious imputation on the County Councils.

LIEUT.-COLONEL PRYCE-JONES said it was a case of the rural against the urban.

*MR. FRANK EDWARDS said the hon. Member had not helped him any further. He only convinced him that he was at the back of the people who wished to block the Bill referred to. Such a charge as that made by the hon. Member was not applicable to the County Councils of Wales, who had, as a rule, done their work efficiently. If they wanted to make men trustworthy they had better trust them as much as possible. The extension of the franchise had proved that thing in this direction, and the present Government was the last that ought to be afraid to trust the people of the country considering the confidence which had been placed in them by the people in recent years. Some hon. Members were fond of talking about devolution, but unfortunately they could not be got to vote for a particular application of the principle. He remembered his hon. friend the Member for the Eifion Division once saying that some Welsh farmers were Liberal by conviction but Tory by profession. That saying might be reversed in the case of the Government. The Motion before the House went further than the extension of powers to the County Councils; it referred to the power of Wales to have separate legislative facilities of its own. Scotland had had much the same facilities granted to it, and the block of business in this House rendered it necessary that some steps should be taken.

Some time back the Prime Minister tried to mend matters by amending Rules of Procedure, but all the arguments used by the right hon. Gentleman then were sound arguments in favour of removing from the House work which it was unable to do. Private Members now had very little chance of carrying any legislation through Parliament; the Government were all-powerful; the House of Commons itself was losing its power. That was a serious matter for the country, and the only remedy was some system of devolution. Home Rule for Ireland was objected to on the ground that it might lead to the dismemberment of the Empire. Personally he had no fear of any such result, but in any case the argument could not be applied to Wales. It was sometimes asked, why should Wales any more than Yorkshire have Home Rule? Considerations of nationality, language, and geographical position placed the two places in totally different categories. There was no doubt as to the use Wales would make of these powers. Certain legislation was urgently required. A Royal Commission had reported on the Welsh land question, making certain moderate recommendations which, if carried into effect, would confer upon Wales distinct boons, but although the necessary Land Bill would not cost the Exchequer a single penny, the Welsh people were unable to obtain it. It was time such a state of affairs came to an end, and he cordially supported the Resolution.

*Mr. DUKE (Plymouth) said that hon. Members from Wales appeared to forget that their fellow-subjects were entitled to be protected from local and artificial sub-divisions of an existing national administration. For hundreds of years the course of policy in this country had been for the betterment of the Kingdom at large by the elimination of local sub-divisions which made a wide scheme of government impossible. In the time of Henry VIII the first great step was taken in the direction of raising Wales to the position of an integral part of the Kingdom, and in more recent times the great Council and the separate Judicature were abolished. These steps were taken for the good of the people ["No"], and to the advantage of the principality. It seemed to be the fashion nowadays for persons, with a legitimate pride in separate nationality, to regard it as a consequence that they should have a separate Government, and that any majority of persons of a particular nationality should have the right to impose laws on the minority. Why should not the same position be granted to Cornishmen? [An hon. Member: Why not Ireland?] The cases of Ireland and Wales were entirely different. Down to 100 years ago Ireland had been an independent kingdom, while the position of Wales was that of a principality which for many hundreds of years had been more and more closely identified in its Government with this country.

It was an impossible suggestion that the County Councils in Wales should form the basis of a new system of Government. Was there to be a separate system of Welsh taxation, or was the Welsh administration of the future to be set up at the cost of the United Kingdom at large? Was this Parliament to levy taxes to be appropriated to local purposes in Wales defined by the County Councils? He thought these practical questions had not been considered by the supporters of the Resolution, because this was not a practical proposal. The people of England as a whole, and a large minority of the people of Wales, were strongly opposed to the setting up of an independent legislative or administrative body of a national character in any part of the United Kingdom. With the desire for a wise delegation of local administrative powers he entirely sympathised. It was most unfortunate that County Councils, where there was practical unanimity with regard to such matters as providing a water supply and so forth, should not have, with some moderate provision for appeal to an authority in which all parties would have confidence, power to carry out local government and make it efficient for all purposes. Where he joined issue was in the proposal to set up something in the nature of a national administration wherever there could be found the remains of an ancient national constituent of what is now the United Kingdom.

Mr. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross) heartily supported the Resolution. Scottish Private Bill Procedure had been several times alluded to. It was not all that they desired or hoped to get, but it had conferred a great boon on the people of Scotland. Since he first entered the House he had been a consistent supporter of the principle of devolution. He had never supported anything in the nature of an independent Parliament, but he would strongly support the extension to Wales of the system which had been applied to Scotland, believing that it would do much to relieve the pressure of work from which Parliament suffered.

General LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) said the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had struck the right chord. What he suggested was perfectly reasonable; but when it came to a separate Parliament for Wales, with all the matters intrusted to it which had been indicated in the debate, that he could not support. He lived in Canada at the time the Federal Government was organised, but the organisation was not carried out, as some hon. Members seemed to suppose, by way of devolution. It was a number of self-governing communities which decided to unite in order that for certain purposes they might act as one. It was no idea of a central body devolving certain duties on outlying communities; it was exactly the opposite. They had yet to see how the system worked in Australia. He did not think the object of his hon. friend would be obtained by a system of devolution from a central to a provincial organisation, but he thought a great deal might be done to take local work out of the hands of Parliament. It was for some local organisation to be devised that would relieve Parliament of local work. How to create such an organisation was a matter which had got to be determined. At the present moment the proposals put forward were very vague, and he could not agree to pass this Resolution which would leave matters to be worked out in the direction of the views expressed by the hon. Member for Radnorshire. If this Resolution simply meant the relief suggested by the hon. Member for Clackmannan and Kinross, who had just sat down, everybody would agree to it. The experiment had been tried in Scotland, where it had proved successful; and at the time the Act was passed for Scotland it was understood that if it proved a success it should be extended to other parts of the country. Until they had something definite showing what this Resolution was intended to lead up to, he did not think they were justified in passing it.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District) said he thought the observations made by the hon. Member opposite with regard to Canada had very little relevance to the question they were now considering. His hon. friend's Motion was somewhat large in its terms, but seeing that they were not able to introduce the Bill which his hon. friend brought in last year, and seeing that they had been unable to induce the President of the Local Government Board to modify his attitude, the only course for them to take was to place such a Resolution on the Paper, enabling Welsh Members to express their views upon the numerous questions connected with local government in Wales, which had arisen very largely in connection with the working of the Education Act.

The speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Plymouth appeared to him to show that he had hardly grasped the true position of Wales in regard to the United Kingdom. He had represented Wales as coming into partnership with the United Kingdom willingly, but that was not the case. He had stated that at one time Scotland was a kingdom, but he would remind the hon. Member that the same also applied to Wales. It was perfectly true that in 1830 the Welsh Judicature was suppressed, but not in accordance with the feelings of the Welsh people, or with the sentiment of the lawyers at Westminster, nor was it done with the approval of the Welsh Tory Members of this House at the time. They were coming to a time when they would have to sum up the administration of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board.

The hon. Member for East Glamorgan, with the conciliatory attitude which was so well adapted to his personality, was inclined to be friendly towards the President of the Local Government Board. He could not help recalling what had taken place in Parliament. Discussions about Welsh affairs were no new matters. With regard to the importation of cattle into West Glamorganshire, in order that the price of meat might be reduced to the working classes of that part of the county, when the right hon. Gentleman was approached to remedy this, he said "no." When it was a question of the Agricultural Holdings Bill, and they asked the right hon. Gentleman to embody certain clauses for Wales, which had been recommended by Lord Kenyon and Sir John Llewellyn, again the right hon. Gentleman said "no." When they asked him to agree to the Bill of the hon. Member for Radnorshire, once more the answer of the right hon. Gentleman was "no." Like Mephistopheles he was, as far as Wales was concerned, the spirit of the everlasting "no." They had always been ready to look upon the right hon. Gentleman as a great constructive statesman, but what had they discovered? They had found that really his attitude was a Quarter Sessions attitude, and that he had got what Lord Beaconsfield called "the Quarter Sessions mind." The right hon. Gentleman thought that what was good enough for Wiltshire was good enough for Wales, but this Resolution was a protest against that attitude.

He did not want to go into any great details, because the character of this Motion, and the limited time at their disposal, prevented that. Their point was that Wales was a separate entity by virtue of its history and its social and economic conditions, and by virtue of the fact that its own language was spoken by over 50 per cent. of its inhabitants; and that in all the essential elements which went to form a nationality Wales was distinct from any other county in England, Scotland or Ireland. That point had never been fairly and squarely met by the right hon. Gentleman. They wanted from the Government a definite recognition of this for many purposes, for Wales was a separate entity. They were not wild and sentimental persons imbued with any notion of separation from the United Kingdom. Why was Wales always treated like this? They understood the enormous benefits that England obtained from its connection with Wales, but everybody seemed to speak as though all the advantages of this connection were on the side of Wales. The hon. Member opposite seemed to think that Wales derived great advantages from being connected with England, but if England would only put Wales in the position of the Colony of Tasmania, he believed Welshmen would be ready to accept it. In that case they would not have to pay towards the cost of Imperial defence, or the expensive luxury of a Secretary of State for the Colonies. He would not, however, pursue the general argument.

MR. WALTER LONG: Hear, hear!

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said that apparently the right hon. Gentleman did not agree with that argument.

MR. WALTER LONG: Not with that particular one.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES, continuing, said he endorsed his hon. friend's remarks as to the working of the Scottish Private Procedure Bill. He wished to impress upon the Government that the time seemed to have come when it was quite possible to extend to Wales a system of a similar character to that which now existed in Scotland. He could, of course, go into many details connected with Wales without raising any broad and general questions or any controversy between hon. Gentlemen opposite and hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Opposition side in regard to which some alteration might be made. There was the question of extending the powers of the County Councils so as to enable them to combine together. The question of the main roads had been referred to, but he would remind the hon. Member that they already possessed a special authority dealing with main roads. He would now conclude, as he thought he had given a sufficient answer to the criticisms which had been passed on the Motion of his hon. friend.

MR. STOCK (Liverpool, Walton) said he would not follow the hon. and learned Member beyond saying he had made quite an unnecessary attack on his right hon. friend, who, outside his office, had as much right to speak for Wales as Bristol. The only claim he had to intervene in this debate was, being resident in a border county, he was constantly in contact with Welshmen and Welsh interests. He could only speak in broad terms in regard to the Motion before the House, and give the reason why he should vote against it. The House believed there was no general demand for local self-government in Wales, and he did not believe a scheme of the kind suggested would tend to promote efficiency in local government in Wales. There was no doubt Welsh County Councils, like the majority of her representatives in this House—he would not like to say that this showed Wales was more enlightened than England—were chiefly of one political complexion. Therefore he thought subjects affecting private rights or interests ought to continue to have the benefit of the impartial control of a central authority. Lastly, if this demand were granted, as the mover of the Motion admitted, there would be no finality. Therefore, a call for administrative control would be followed by one for legislative control, or, in plain words, it meant finally an appeal for Home Rule all round. He did not think the Imperial Parliament would ever consent to such a thing, and therefore he should oppose the Motion.

*MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire) said he should like at the outset to thank the President of the Local Government Board for the courtesy and patience he showed to a deputation from Wales which waited upon him last year. Upon that occasion the right hon. Gentleman expressed his sympathy with their object, and he, personally, should have liked to have seen that sympathy take a more practical form. He was sorry the right hon. Gentleman had not considered more favourably the Bill of his hon. friend the Member for Radnorshire. The right hon. Gentleman had argued that there was no argument to justify the particular change suggested by the case of Wales without extending it to the North of England. The right hon. Gentleman had spent a good deal of time in the Principality, and knew the feelings and wants of the Welsh people, and he understood that the right hon. Gentleman had property there which was likely to turn out another El Dorado. Consequently he had expected him to have shown more sympathy towards Wales in regard to this matter. Everything must have a beginning, why not begin with Wales in these matters. Surely Wales deserved some consideration. He did not think they would find that the Local Government Act of 1888 had been better administered anywhere than in Wales.

On their local bodies they had elected in some cases members of the Conservative party as chairmen, and in Wales they would find Conservatives, Liberals, Nonconformists and Churchmen putting aside their religious and political differences, and all working together for the common good of their country. The northern part of Wales, with which he was connected, was known as the country of the white kid gloves, and at the court with which he was associated he had received sufficient white kid gloves to keep his boys in gloves for dances for the next two years. It was recognised that Scotland, Wales, and Ireland had certain racial characteristics which distinguished them from England. He instanced their keener enthusiasm in regard to matters in connection with social progress and the well-being of the people. Welshmen, Scotchmen, and Irishmen had a position all their own in the consciousness that they belonged to small nations, imbued, permeated, and invigorated by the strong feeling of nationality. This might be said to be mere sentiment, but sentiment, after all, was the well-spring of all that was best and noblest in human life and character, and their attachment to national sentiment could not but help them to a proper conception of what an Empire ought to be—free, tolerant, non-aggressive, the friend, protector, and nursing mother of freedom. But in the present day with its spirit of commercial Imperialism, unsatisfied greed, vulgar tone, and worship of wealth, we were in danger of drifting into ways full of peril to the higher aspirations of a free people. He thought Parliament might consider the feeling of Wales and help the people to keep alive the distinctive sense of their nationality. What would mankind be without varieties of nationality? It would be a world without the charm of diversity between hill and dale. It would be one dead-level plain of vulgar uniformity. What would history have been had any of the despots from Nimrod down to Napoleon been able to flatten out the whole world into one huge dominion in which there was but one speech and one language, in which there had been nothing distinctive between the glory that was Greece, and the grandeur that was Rome, in which every mark had been obliterated which gave a different aspect to the brilliancy of France, the fascination of Italy, the diligence of Germany, and the energy of Great Britain? He was sure they must all hope for the time when nations "shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruninghooks," but they wished them to be nations still, in all the charm of these separate dominions which they had received from their national surroundings, in which they had been cradled by the hand of God. He maintained that Great Britain would inevitably be a considerable loser were Welsh nationality indistinguishably merged in the common English life.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I am sure it is unnecessary for me to say that we have listened with considerable interest to the debate; and that the speech which the hon. Gentleman has just made was one of great eloquence and commanded alike the sympathy and admiration of the House of Commons. The difficulty in which I find myself in dealing with this question on behalf of the Government is that, interesting though the debate has been, and practical from at all events one point of view, as the speeches have been, yet we have never really throughout the debate come to close quarters with the real proposition made in the Motion of the hon. Member for Carnarvon. That Motion is that a separate form of local self-government should be granted to Wales. A great deal has been said by hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House as to the advantages which would flow to Wales if this Motion were to be adopted, and the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken told us in very eloquent terms of the good that would come to his country if she were given the advantages which he believed she would derive from the adoption of this Resolution; but with one or two exceptions of a somewhat vague character with which I shall deal in a moment, no case has been made out which would justify the granting either to Wales, or to any other part of the United Kingdom, of a system of local government different from that which now exists.

What argument has been advanced to show that Wales or Scotland—those are the two countries which have been referred to chiefly to-night—suffer under the existing system? I venture to say that, if a careful examination is made, it will lead us to a totally different conclusion. The hon. Member who moved the Resolution in an eloquent speech, and the hon. Member for Clackmannan and Kinross who spoke on behalf of Scotland, told the House that the justification of the demand now being made was to be found in the fact that both Scotland and Wales already enjoyed separate legislation for dealing with a variety of subjects which had been useful to both these countries and had produced to them great advantages. If it be true that the Imperial Parliament has been able to deal both with Scotland and Wales already with regard to a variety of questions specially affecting those countries in a different manner from that in which the same questions are dealt with when they affect England, what reason is there that the Imperial Parliament cannot deal in the future with those questions? Why is Wales to have a separate local governing body, and what is that body going to do?

There is one part of the Question in regard to which rather more definite remarks have been made. That is the Private Bill question, which has already been dealt with in Scotland, and with regard to which it is suggested that different procedure should be adopted in regard to this country. I have long been interested in the Private Bill system of this House, and I have long believed that it will be necessary to alter that system, and that one of the first alterations to be made, if you are to relieve Parliament of some of the work which unduly presses on it at the present time, must be by devolution in regard to that part of our labours. But that must not be taken as a suggestion that you are to have separate Private Bill procedure for Wales.

The demands from the North of England in regard to Private Bill legislation are as great and pressing as any that come from Wales. While I admit, and I am proud of the fact, that our experiment with Scotland has been completely successful, I am not prepared to admit that there is any justification on the part of Wales for Private Bill procedure which cannot be made by those populous parts of England from which Private Bills emanate more frequently than from other parts. With the exception of the suggestion that there should be an Amendment of the Private Bill procedure system, what else has been suggested? Some reference was made earlier in the debate to the Bill which is already on the Paper, and which I introduced last session in consequence of the action taken by the hon. Member for Radnorshire. That Bill was not successful last year. I hope it will be more successful this year. Hon. Gentlemen opposite told us that the Bill was defeated by the English boroughs. They are not really quite accurate. That Bill found opponents among some of the English boroughs, and I think that was owing to a misunderstanding on their part of what the effect of the Bill would be, but it has found something more serious than the criticism of the English boroughs in the opposition of one Member of this House who, as hon. Gentlemen know, devotes his special attention to legislative proposals, particularly when we are approaching twelve o'clock, and who exercises a very severe control over any proposals that are made at that period of the evening.

*MR. WILLIAM JONES said the only gentlemen who blocked the Bill were English Members.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am not referring to "blocks," I am referring to the action of an hon. Member opposite. I noticed this evening when the hon. Member stated that he believed this block had been removed, the hon. Member to whom I am referring signified that that was an incorrect description of his attitude, and that he maintained the same position now as he took up a few days ago. Be that as it may, I hope we may find a means of pressing the Bill even in the face of the opposition of the hon. Gentleman to whom I have referred. That Bill does not propose to do all that has been suggested this evening. What I consider that the Bill proposes to do is, to enable some of these powers to be conferred on separate County Councils, whereas, as the law stands, they can only be conferred on all at the same time. It does not go so far as some hon. Gentlemen desire, but I believe it will be a step in the right direction.

Now, let me come to closer quarters with the proposal to establish some central body in Wales which should take the place of the Local Government Board, the Board of Trade, the Home Office, or any other Department which has central control. There was some little controversy early in the evening between the hon. Member for the Montgomery Boroughs and the hon. Gentleman opposite as to whether the County Councils had been fully consulted before the deputation waited on me last year. I know nothing of what took place before that deputation came, but I would apply to that a more practical test than the one raised by my hon. friend. My hon. friend says it is not a question between Tory and Liberal, but one between town and county. I can assure the hon. Member for Radnorshire that in Wales the controversy between town and county exists in a marked degree. Only the other day I was called upon to arbitrate in a case in which a Welsh County Council complained that a Welsh Town Council were making an undue demand upon them in respect to the cost of the maintenance of highways. This is essentially one of those local questions which the hon. Gentleman thought, speaking in general terms, might properly be left to the local authorities. Yet we find in this case, as in similar cases, the County Council complaining in the most bitter terms of the action of the Town Council, while the Town Council declared that they were entitled to the demand they were making. Are those who present this claim quite sure that these local authorities are willing to see these powers transferred to a central board in Wales? Are they quite sure that if that central board were established you would not have at once arising the very differences between town and county which arise now? With regard to the composition of the County Councils, I do not know whether what my hon. friend said was correct in the case of Wales, but I do not think he is quite correct in the case of England. He seemed to believe that the County Councils were largely composed of rural representatives, but in a great many of the English counties it is undoubtedly not so. In the English counties there is a predominance of urban representatives.

LIEUT.-COLONEL PRYCE-JONES: In Wales the proportion is about one in four—one urban and three rural representatives.

MR. WALTER LONG: That really is not important to my argument.

LIEUT.-COLONEL PRYCE-JONES: But it is.

MR. WALTER LONG: No; whether a majority of the representatives come from the urban or country districts is not important. All that I am endeavouring to point out to the House is that on these County Councils you have representatives who come from the urban and the rural districts. In some cases a majority of the members are urban, and in other cases a majority are rural, but from whichever side the majority comes, the County Council has to decide questions which arise as between the rural and the urban districts of the county, and these questions raise in the sharpest possible manner the difference between the town and the country districts. Hitherto these questions have not come up in an acute form, but I believe there will be very considerable opposition even in Wales if it were realised that the jurisdiction now vested in a separate Department in London was transferred to some central body in Wales. On that central body it is obvious there must be a majority either on the urban or the rural side. If there is to be an equal number of both representatives, it is obvious that you will have the casting vote of the chairman. All these questions depend upon the way they affect either the rural or the urban parts of the county. The decisions of a Government Department are not affected by these considerations; they are governed by what they believe to be the equity of the case and general conditions, and, although it is only a matter of opinion, I believe that, if the question arose as to the transference of the powers held by the Local Government Board, the Board of Trade, or any other Department, you would find a great amount of opposition which you do not find now when dealing with the subject only in a general way.

Another argument used to-night is that Wales is justified in claiming separate treatment by the admirable manner in which she has dealt with the Local Government Act and the Welsh Education Act. Nobody who has followed the history of the Local Government Act and the Welsh Education Act will for one moment deny that both have been admirably administered by the Principality. But those Acts have come from the Imperial Parliament, and they have not depended on any local or central board. Wales has got all she wants with regard to education and other questions, as the mover of the Resolution pointed out, without the intervention of any central board or local governing body such as that which is contemplated by the Resolution. What other argument has been advanced in favour of this proposal? The only other argument is that advanced by the hon. Member for Swansea, that Wales is a distinct nationality with a separate language of her own. Surely that language can be talked on County Councils as it is talked on Boards of Guardians and Town Councils, and in the selection of inspectors and other officers who are called upon to deal with these local authorities, I am happy to think it is the invariable rule to appoint men who can speak that language; and therefore there is nothing in the language argument to justify the creation of this central body.

The hon. Member for Radnorshire anticipated the argument that Lancashire and Yorkshire would be equally justified in demanding a separate central body. I am bound to say that if you look at the rateable value of Lancashire and Yorkshire, the population, and the local needs, they would be quite as much entitled to a local governing body as Wales would be. The hon. Gentleman said that we might wait until they asked for it. But surely Wales should be able to show some difficulty under which she labours now, something which prevents the development of her prosperity, something which puts her in a totally different position from that occupied by the rest of the country, before she asks this peculiar and separate treatment. The hon. Member attacked me for what I did when I was at the Board of Agriculture, and he produced very curious evidence in support of his attack. He said the people of West Glamorganshire suffered from the action I took. But what did the people of the rest of Wales think of the action I took in that case? The majority of the Welsh counties supported me heartily in what I did. Why? Because in their opinion, and judging from their experience, my action was beneficial to their industry and trade. The hon. Gentleman's suggestion is, that because one section objected to what I did at that time, they should be given a central body to do in a different way that which the majority approved of.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES: The application was renewed after the right hon. Gentleman left the Board of Agriculture, and we have received no evidence at all to show that Wales objects to the importation of cattle.

MR. WALTER LONG: What I said was, that the people of West Glamorganshire took a different view from other people in Wales.

MR. BRYNMOR-JONES: What other people?

MR. WALTER LONG: I thought the hon. and learned Gentleman was aware of the fact that the majority of the farmers were grazing farmers. It is undoubtedly a fact that the majority of Welsh farmers produce store cattle. It is a valuable industry in Wales, and they did not view with disapproval my action at that time, which had for its object the protection of the flocks and herds of this country. Those who have followed this question know that the same argument was applied in the case of Scotland. There was a small section in Scotland who disapproved of that legislation, but the majority of the people approved of it. [AN HON. MEMBER: "No!"] Oh, yes. I can only judge by the votes in this House, and it was approved, not only on this side, but on the other side also. That is a very thin argument by which to support the proposition before the House to-night—that you should have a local governing body in Wales because the Minister of Agriculture has interfered with the importation of cattle from abroad. What is there advanced to-night to justify us in believing that Wales requires some special local government facilities which are not equally required by the rest of the United Kingdom? What is there to show us that Wales is at present hampered, or that her progress is hindered by the system which is good enough for the rest of the country? Reform may be necessary in regard to Private Bill legislation, but we believe that what may be done for Wales in that respect should also be done for England. We do not, and cannot, admit that Wales has made out any case that would justify separate treatment either in regard to self-government or any of the other matters that have been referred to in the debate.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said that the right hon. Gentleman had stated that no arguments had been adduced by his hon. friends who supported the proposals before the House to prove that there was any necessity for any extension of local self-government in Wales; but the speeches of all his friends had embraced a great number of cases in which such necessity had been put forward from time to time by the Welsh people, and had been rejected by the Imperial Government. It was urged as a reason for refusing these moderate demands that the Imperial Parliament had no time to deal with them. But nothing stronger could be said in favour of the Resolution before the House than that. Even the speech of the right hon. Gentleman had shown how completely the Imperial Parliament had broken down as a legislative machine. Here was a Bill which the right hon. Gentleman believed in and which had the unanimous support of Members on both sides of the House, with the exception of one, but why was it not carried? Because the potent voice of his hon. friend the Member for Mid Lanark was raised against it, and the Imperial Parliament quailed before the hon. Gentleman. There was legislation perfectly practical, which the Government themselves deemed to be absolutely necessary, and which had been asked for by the Welsh people no end of times, and which was yet denied them. The right hon. Gentleman had asked what injury or damage could be traced as a result of the failure of the Imperial Parliament to legislate for Wales. He did not know of any greater injury which could be done to any community than the failure of those in charge of the law to make the law in sympathy with the views of the population in particular parts of the country. It was an injury to the law and a damage to the community itself.

The right hon. Gentleman had said, "Look at the Bills you have had dealing especially with Wales." Yes, but these were Bills which the Welsh people were forced to take because the Imperial Parliament had no time to consider the matter thoroughly. What was still more important was, that a good deal of the special legislation given to Wales was experimental. Take, for instance, temperance legislation. They had an Act of Parliament which dealt with the question of Sunday drinking, but it was rushed through the House because there was no time to deal exhaustively with the details, and the Welsh Members agreed to accept it for what it was worth. In the course of its working, defects in its construction were shown by a good many things that had happened, and a Commission was appointed in 1896 to inquire into the whole matter. That Commission had made a good many recommendations, because they felt that the Act could not be complete unless amended in the direction of their recommendations. But there had not been time to discuss these recommendations in this House, or to introduce any measure founded on them. What, then, was the use of the right hon. Gentleman saying that Wales had got separate legislation when legislation on which all parties were agreed had been waiting for twelve or thirteen years, and yet could not be passed?

The right hon. Gentleman asked: "Where was the injury?" His reply was that the injury could not be calculated. This was a matter which affected the sobriety of large communities, and if the right hon. Gentleman had taken the trouble to read the report of his own Government's Commission, he would have seen that in many places in Wales the law was inoperative because it was not effective, and that the injury caused was beyond the assessment of any court. He could quote many cases of a similar kind. Take education, for instance. They had heard a good deal about it being a bad proposal to give separate legislation to Wales on that question, but the hon. Gentleman below the Gangway had made out the best case for Home Rule. The one argument of the hon. Member for Liverpool was that there was no evidence in support of separate legislation for education for Wales, and that as he lived in an adjoining county he was a better judge of what Wales wanted than the Members sent to Parliament by the Welsh constituencies themselves.

Then the hon. Member for Plymouth talked very glibly of Wales, of its manners and language, and said he knew exactly what the Welsh people wanted, and could tell them what would benefit them much better than they who had lived all their lives in Wales. The hon. Gentleman really knew very little about Wales, but talked with all the assurance which generally accompanied a lack of knowledge. The hon. Member said that the proposal in the Resolution before the House was impracticable. Did he know that the Welsh Members were in this matter simply the humble followers of the Colonial Secretary, the only undamaged Member of the Government that was left? The right hon. Gentleman was undamaged because he had been away. If he had remained at home his merits also would have disappeared.

*MR. DUKE said he did not think the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies had ever proposed to set up a Welsh Parliament to deal with such national questions as the Church and the land.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the Colonial Secretary had not called it a parliament, but a local assembly; the Welsh Members called it local self-government, and he did not know that these phrases differed very much in meaning. In fact, parliament was not a Welsh word at all. They used the word "Cyngor," and the hon. and learned Member who presumed to be able to govern Wales could not tell the meaning of that word.

*MR. DUKE said that the point between them was not what was the name for a Welsh Assembly, but what its functions were to be; whether it was to legislate on matters of Imperial or national policy. He maintained that the right hon. the Colonial Secretary had not proposed any such assembly.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Nor did the Welsh Members; and now that they and the hon. and learned Member understood each other, perhaps the hon. and learned Member would vote for them. They did not propose to set up a Parliament to deal with Church reform or land reform. What the Colonial Secretary desired was to delegate to local assemblies, to local, national, or provincial assemblies such questions as Education, Public Works, Local Government, and Private Bill Legislation. If these matters were taken from the Imperial Parliament, said the Colonial Secretary, it would relieve the Imperial Parliament of an immense amount of labour. For his own part he, and he believed the vast majority of the Welsh Members, would accept every syllable of the Colonial Secretary's declaration. Would the hon. and learned Member for Plymouth and his friends do that? It was all very well for the hon. and learned Member to get up and talk as he did, but they were really getting so accustomed to attack and flout their leaders that, he was sorry to say, the contagion had extended even to Plymouth. All that he proposed was that this great policy which had been laid down by the Colonial Secretary, the saviour of this Government, should be applied to Wales now. It was, perhaps, a little belated, because the letter in which the Colonial Secretary propounded that policy was dated a good time ago. But then the right hon. Gentleman had since been travelling in South Africa.

This was purely a practical proposal. There was no notion of separation in Wales. He had never heard from any platform in Wales a single suggestion from a single Welsh orator, or even from an Englishman in Wales, that they desired separation, or anything in the nature of separation. Wales gave this country a dynasty once; Welshmen governed the destinies of this Empire, and it had never been governed well since. It was not an English Empire; it was a Welsh Empire; and no Welshman suggested that Wales should divest herself of her inheritance—of what she had really given to England. They did not want anything of the kind, and nobody would dream of exploiting any assembly of the character proposed except for the purpose of improving the condition of the Welsh people. The hon. and learned Member talked of the inheritance of Englishmen in Wales, but Englishmen in Wales were quite as keenly in favour of self-government as Welshmen. The hon. and learned Gentleman did not know even the elements of the case, although he must say that, as a rule, that was not his defect. At any rate they in Wales were as loyal and as law-abiding as any in the whole kingdom. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] He admitted that there might be certain exceptions, and at any rate the hon. and learned Member should have mastered the subject of their case in Wales. The Welsh Members were too few in number to compel the concession of their demands, but they put forward claims which eventually were recognised. Even the Prime Minister had had to declare that a good deal which they had urged in regard to education was true.

It was the habit of the Government to give them a Tuesday afternoon to discuss their complaints, but they had never the remotest chance of getting their affairs attended to. South Africa had consumed three or four years of the time of the Imperial Parliament; the chance of Ireland came this year and would probably occupy a good deal more than this year; while the claims of Scotland would come next to be considered, and after that it might be the West Coast of Africa, or the Mad Mullah. They never could tell what the Colonial Secretary would bring forth. The result, however, was as he had said—that Wales had no chance of having her case attended to. Take last year. What happened was that an Education Bill was introduced to deal with the whole education in England and Wales, but it was clearly inapplicable to Wales. More than half the people of Wales were against it, and why should it have been forced upon them? Suppose the Prime Minister had said that that was a matter for the Welsh people to deal with, seeing that they managed secondary and higher education so admirably, he would have saved much worry to himself, and a great deal of the time of the House of Commons.

Last year a Bill was introduced by the hon. Member for Radnorshire, which was supported practically by all the Welsh County Councils, and although it had been sent round to every town in Wales there was no protest against it except from his hon. friend the Member for Newton, who protested against every proposal. Under these circumstances why on earth should not the right hon. Gentleman give them a chance of dealing with matters purely Welsh? It was perfectly clear that the Imperial Parliament could not go on as it was at the present moment. Business men on both sides of the House recognised that fact. They had too much to do. Even on the Education Bill the Prime Minister did not complain that there was obstruction, and in that he thought the right hon. Gentleman was right. He had never seen less obstruction in the sense of Amendments being moved that were not substantial; but on any Bill a sufficient number of Amendments could be moved and relevant speeches made to take up the whole of the session. Did not that prove that the Imperial Parliament could not do more than lay down general principles and give directions, leaving it to the local authorities to carry them out. Take the School Boards at the present moment, for instance. They had really power to establish a religion by bye-laws. He would suggest that representatives from the Welsh County Councils should sit for two or three months in the year with the Welsh Members of Parliament to frame proposals with regard to local matters to be laid before the Imperial Parliament, which could either throw them out, or accept them.

The English people would never consent to the cutting up of the Imperial Parliament, or to the mutilation of the Imperial Parliament. He was not now speaking of Home Rule, which appeared to be on a different footing; but he thought that what he had said would apply to Scotland as well as to Wales. No one wanted to cut the Imperial Parliament up; all that was wanted was some scheme that would relieve the Imperial Parliament of purely local and provincial affairs, reserving to the Imperial Parliament full powers to modify or reject any proposals which might be injurious to any interest or dangerous to sound government. Let the representatives of the Welsh County Councils and the representatives of Wales in the Imperial Parliament meet for a certain number of months every year; that would relieve the Imperial Parliament; and would conduce to the solidarity and strength of the Empire, because it would produce greater contentment.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 74; Noes, 164. (Division List No. 37.)

AYES

Abraham, W. (*Cork, N.E.*)
Barry, E. (*Cork, S.*)
Bayley, Thomas (*Derbyshire*)
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, Geo. M. (*Edinburgh*)
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (*Armagh, S.*)
Causton, Richard Knight
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (*Carmarthen*)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (*Cardign*
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (*Lanark*)
Duffy, William J.
Edwards, Frank
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hardie, J. Keir (*Merthyr Tyd*
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harrington, Timothy
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Labouchere, Henry
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (*Louth, S.*)
O'Brien, K. (*Tipperary, Mid*)
O'Brien, Patrick (*Kilkenny*)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Reddy, M.
Redmond, Jn. E. (*Waterford*)
Redmond, William (*Clare*)
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, Herbt. L. (*Cleveland*)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sinclair, John (*Forfarshire*)

Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Sir A. (*Glam., E.*)
Thomas, David A. (*Merthyr*)
Thomas, J. A. (*Glam., Gower*)
Ure, Alexander
Wason, E. (*Clackmannan*)
White, Luke (*York, E. R.*)
Whitley, J. H. (*Halifax*)
Williams, O. (*Merioneth*)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (*Hudd'rsf'd*

Tellers for the Ayes—
Mr. William Jones and
Mr. Brynmor Jones.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Aug. Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther, H. T.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt Hon. Sir H.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (*Man'r*
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (*Leeds*
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benj.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V C W (*Derbysh.*)
Cecil, Evelyn (*Aston Manor*)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J A (*Worc*
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Collings, Right Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasgow*
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Cox, Irwin Edwd. Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, H. Shepherd (*Bolton*)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Jos. C.
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Ed.
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (*Man'r*
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (*St. Albans*
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (*Linc*
Gray, Ernest (*West Ham*)
Greene, Sir E. W. (*Bury St. Ed.*
Greene, W. Raymond- (*Cambs*
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld. G. (*Midx*
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robt. Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope, J. F. (*Sheff., B'tside*)
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, Jno (*Kent, Faver'hm*
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (*Salop*
Keswick, William
Knowles, Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (*Glasgow*
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (*Bristol, S.*
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas, Col. Francis (*Lowestoft*
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (*Liverpool*)
M'Killop, Jas. (*Stirlingshire*)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, W. J. H. (*Dumfriessh.*
Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
Morgan, D. J. (*Walthamstow*)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (*Bute*
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (*Salisbury*)
Pease, H. Pike (*Darlington*)
Peel, Hn. Wm. R. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Renwick, George
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson
Robertson, H. (*Hackney*)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Saml. Alexander
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (*Isle of Wight*
Sinclair, Louis (*Romford*)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (*Hertford, E.*)
Smith, Jas. Parker (*Lanarks.*)
Stanley, Hon. A. (*Ormskirk*)
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (*Chichester*)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. E. M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (*Exeter*)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Webb, Col. William George
Whiteley, H. (*Ashton-u.-Lyne*)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (*Dorset*)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. S. (*York, E. R.*)
Wilson John (*Glasgow*)
Wilson, J. W. (*Worcestersh. N.*
Wodehouse, Rt Hn. E. R. (*Bath*
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Noes—
Mr. George Ormsby-Gore
and Mr. Stock.

SCHOOL BOARD ELECTORATE (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said this was a Bill to extend the School Board franchise in Scotland. At present, there was a curious anomaly, under which hundreds of electors who could vote for a Member of Parliament or a County Councillor, could not vote at a School Board election. Obviously a School Board election was far more interesting to parents than even a County Council election; and all the

Bill said was that all persons entitled to vote at a County Council election should be entitled to vote at a School Board election. If the voter were qualified to vote at a County Council election surely he ought to be qualified to vote at a School Board election. It was to remove that anomaly that the Bill was brought in, and he hoped the House would pass the Second Reading. He begged to move.

SIR FREDRICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) said he was surprised that the hon. Member should have moved the Second Reading of the Bill at such a late hour, because the hon. Member himself had always laid it down as one of the first principles to be observed in this House that no Bill should be taken at ten minutes to midnight; and that all Bills required proper consideration. He had heard the hon. Member on more occasions than one move to report Progress because a Bill could not be considered in the time that remained. The ground on which, as far as he could gather, the hon. Member moved the second reading was that people in Scotland were more interested in School Board elections than in elections for Parliament or the County Councils. He, however, failed to see why electors in Scotland should have a greater interest in School Board elections than in Parliamentary elections. Did the hon. Member contend that a School Board election was more important than a Parliamentary election?

MR. CALDWELL said that the electors ought to be qualified to vote at both elections.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY said that at the present moment they were not qualified by law to vote at School Board elections; and the hon. Member thought they should, because School Board elections were more important than Parliamentary elections. He ventured to disagree with the hon. Gentleman. An hon. Member had just given interesting figures which showed that 87 per cent. of the electors voted at Parliamentary elections, and only 30 per cent. at School Board elections. That showed that the electors in Scotland did not agree with the hon. Gentleman that School Board elections were more important than Parliamentary elections. It seemed to him that because a certain number of persons were qualified to vote at County Council elections that was no reason why they should be qualified to vote at School Board elections. A man who was only rated at £4 would not contribute very much to the expenditure of the School Board; and the old principle that taxation and representation should go together should be applied. Human nature being such as it was, a man who contributed only a little, would not be anxious that the expenditure should be kept down.

And, it being Midnight, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SATURDAYS (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee—

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:—

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Tuesday next.

Adjourned at three minutes after
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 19th March, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:

Wakefield and District Tramways [H.L.]. The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Bill [H.L.]. A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee.

St. Philip's Chapel (Regent Street) Bill [H.L.]; West Bromwich Corporation Bill [H.L.]; All Saints, Poplar (Rate Abolition) Bill [H.L.]. Reports from his Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Birmingham District Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Thames River Steamboat Service Bill; Jewish Colonisation Association (Petition for Bill). Examiner's Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Thursday next.

St. Philip's Chapel (Regent Street) Bill [H.L.]; West Bromwich Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a (according to order).

All Saints, Poplar (Rate Abolition) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a (according to order).

Scottish American Mortgage Company, Limited Bill [H.L.], committed.

Hastings Harbour District Railway Bill [H.L.]. Committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Barry Railway Bill [H.L.]. The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn: The order made on Thursday last discharged, and Bill committed.

Nantwich Gas Bill [H.L.]. The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill: The Orders made on Thursday last discharged: Ordered, that the Bill be not further proceeded with.

Chard Corporation Gas and Electricity Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table: The orders made on the 9th of March and Thursday last discharged; and Bill committed.

British Gas Light Company (Norwich) Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table: The orders made on Thursday last discharged; and Bill committed.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

HOUSE OF LORDS MANUSCRIPTS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Calendar of the Manuscripts of the House of Lords, Volume II. (New Series), in continuation of the volumes issued under the authority of the Historical Manuscripts Commission: The same was ordered to be printed. (No. 18.)

CHINA, No. 2 (1903).

Provisional rules defining the respective jurisdiction of the mixed courts of the International and French Settlements at Shanghai.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

1. Reports from University Colleges (1902).

2. Provisional code of regulations for public elementary schools and training colleges; with schedules (1903). Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS, 1853-1891 (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Licence granted by his Majesty to James Johnstone, a convict under detention in Wormwood Scrubbs Prison, permitting him to leave the prison on condition of his proceeding to the Middlesex Hospital, there to be examined, and, if necessary, to undergo an operation, and there remaining in the custody of a prison officer, and afterwards returning when fit to do so to Wormwood Scrubbs Prison.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

PUBLIC RECORDS (ADMIRALTY DEPARTMENT).

Tenth Schedule containing a list and particulars of classes of documents which have been removed from the office of the Commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and deposited in the Public Record Office, but which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES, WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION SCHEMES, INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES, AND TRADE UNIONS.

Reports of the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies, for the year ended 31st December 1902: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING (LONDON) BILL [H.L.]

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

LORD WOLVERTON: My Lords, the object of this Bill is a very simple one, and one which must be very familiar to those of your Lordships who carry on the Committee work of this House. A considerable number of small alterations in the boundaries of the areas of local authorities in London have been made under the London Government Act, 1899, and these necessitate corresponding adjustments of the boundaries of electric lighting areas. These electric lighting boundaries have not been dealt with by the schemes under the London Government Act, as it was considered more convenient that they should be dealt with as a whole by a single Bill. This Bill is introduced for the purpose. If your Lordships consent to read the Bill a second time, the Board of Trade will be prepared, where any difference of opinion arises between the areas concerned, to call a conference, and they have great hopes that that conference will save your Lordships the trouble of a Select Committee. The conference would be held at the Board of Trade, and some high official of that department would be nominated as a member. I beg to move the Second Reading.

Moved, that the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*Lord Wolverton.*)

Bill read 2ª (according to order).

INSPECTION OF MOTOR BOILERS.

THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, I beg to ask his Majesty's Government, in view of the increasing number of small steam boilers in use in motors, motor omnibuses, steam lorries, etc., what system of inspection is adopted with regard to these boilers. I do not, of course, refer to water-tube boilers used in motors and motor omnibuses. Your Lordships are no doubt aware that a number of these lorries and motors move about the streets of London, and if an accident occurred, say, in Piccadilly Circus, it would have a most disastrous effect. I believe that last year an explosion of this sort did occur in the country, and that the man who was driving the motor was never seen again.

LORD WOLVERTON: My Lords, in answer to the noble Earl's question I have to state that there is no system of Government inspection of steam boilers in vehicles of the kind to which the noble Lord refers. Neither the Board of Trade nor the Local Government Board have power to require such inspection, but, in the event of an explosion of a boiler coming under the provisions of the Boiler Explosion Acts, 1882 and 1890, the Board of Trade have power to order a preliminary inquiry or formal investigation into the circumstances. Steam boilers in motors would, it is thought, come under these Acts. They could hardly be regarded as domestic boilers, though the point might be argued in the case of private motor carriages.

THE EARL OF MAYO: I beg to give notice that I will raise the Question at a later period.

DISCHARGE OF SOLDIERS WITHOUT PENSIONS.

THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, I beg to ask His Majesty's Government (1) how many soldiers have, since the outbreak of war in South Africa, been discharged from the Army without pensions for diseases not directly attributable to active service in the field; (2) whether, in view of the large number of men so discharged, the medical examination of recruits is carried out with sufficient care, as the discharge of so many destitute men must have a prejudicial effect on voluntary recruiting.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (the Earl of HARDWICKE): My Lords, I am perfectly willing to give the noble Earl all the information I can on the subject. He asks, in the first place, how many soldiers have, since the outbreak of war in South Africa, been discharged from the Army without pensions for diseases not directly attributable to active service in the field. During the years 1899, 1900, 1901 and 1902 the total number of men so discharged was 6,745. As to the second question, I do not think we can admit that the number I have mentioned is so large as to have a prejudicial effect on recruiting. I would point out to the noble Earl that, as a matter of fact, during the last two years we have had better recruiting than ever before, and it is only during the last few years that so many men have been discharged. Prior to the war the number of men so discharged was comparatively small; in 1899 the number was 275, and in 1900 it went up to 2,539. During the years I have mentioned the total number of recruits enlisted was 126,149, and therefore the percentage of men discharged from the Army, without pensions, for diseases not directly attributable to active service in the field, is only five per cent, which I think we may consider comparatively small.

Then the noble Earl suggests that the medical examination of recruits is not carried out with sufficient care. The Commander-in-Chief has laid down the very strictest instructions that no recruit is to be sent before the examining medical officer unless he has a reasonable chance of passing—that is to say, when he first comes forward and expresses his wish to join the Colours, the recruiting officer is supposed to satisfy himself that the man has a reasonable chance of passing the medical officer before taking him. In spite of that very strict order the number of men who are rejected prior to enlistment is over 32 per cent. If the noble Earl will refer to the report of the Inspector-General of Recruiting for this year, he will see that during the year 1902 the number of men who desired to enlist and were medically examined was 87,609, and that the number who were rejected prior to enlistment for various ailments and for want of physical development was 28,221. I think that shows that the medical examination is carried out with very great care, and that it would be difficult to improve upon the system now in force. The noble Earl further suggests that the men so discharged are in a destitute condition. I would point out that men who have been rejected for pensions, always receive a gratuity amounting to not less than £2, and that should any of them have been enlisted for over three years they receive on discharge a gratuity of £1 for each completed year or portion of a year of service up to a maximum of £12, so that in many instances the men discharged from the Colours for the causes mentioned by the noble Earl received an amount sometimes as large as £12, and never less that £2. When soldiers come before the Commissioners of Chelsea Hospital, owing to injury or illness incurred on service, they are very often given pensions for six or twelve months pending further examination, but the figures I have given the noble Earl are quite apart from terminable pensions.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: Before the House adjourns I desire, with your Lordships' permission, to present a Bill the object of which is to secure uniformity in the granting, by way of renewal or transfer, of licences for the sale of intoxicating liquors. This is not my Bill. It was drafted by the late Lord Bramwell, but, unfortunately for this House and the country, that distinguished lawyer died before he could bring it in. It was drawn up in consequence of what appeared to Lord Bramwell to be the injustice of the existing law, as shown in the case of Sharp *v.* Wakefield, and I think that what is taking place at the present time proves that some measure of the kind is necessary. I therefore present this Bill for your Lordships' consideration, and beg to move that it be read a first time.

Moved, that the Bill be now read 1^a.—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

On Question, agreed to; Bill read 1^a and to be printed (No. 19).

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, till To-morrow a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 19*th March*, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz.:—

Cheshire Lines Committee Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PETITIONS.

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Herne Bay; Halifax (two); Preston; Nottingham; Wimbledon; Ramsgate; Newcastle-upon-Tyne; and, Margate; to lie upon the Table.

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Houston; Govan; and, Lochwinnoch; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petitions against: from Newhaven; Prescot; Pershore; Kingston-upon-Hull; Sunderland; Wem; Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Eastry; and, Woodbridge; to lie upon the Table.

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

Petition from Alloa, against establishment; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NEATH, PONTARDAWE, AND BRYNAMAN RAILWAY BILL.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th March; *Mr. Gerald Balfour*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 82.]

ARMY (CLOTHING FACTORY).

Annual Account presented, of the Royal Army Clothing Factory for the year 1901 – 1902, with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 83.]

ARMY (ORDNANCE FACTORIES).

Annual Account presented, for the year 1901–1902, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 84.]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (ARMY VOTES).

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 16th March, 1903, under the Appropriation Act, 1902, authorising the temporary application of surpluses on certain Army Votes for the year 1902–1903, to defray excesses on certain Army Votes for the same year [pursuant to Resolution of the House of 4th March, 1879]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 85.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

New German Tariff—Countervailing Duties.

COLONEL SADLER (Middlesbrough): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been directed to the increase of duties on British manufactured goods exported to Germany under the new German tariff; and will he consider the advisability of imposing countervailing duties on German manufactured goods imported into Great Britain, or taking steps to bring about a revision of the tariff.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The new German tariff to which my hon. friend alludes is not in operation, and there has consequently been no increase in the duties on British manufactured goods exported to Germany. If he will refer to the issue of the *Board of Trade Journal*, dated 12th March (which he will be able to consult in the Library), he will find a statement on page 545 as to the character and scope of this tariff, and will see that before coming into force the tariff is liable to modification as the result of commercial negotiations between Germany and other Powers. Representations as to the effect of the tariff, if applied to imports from the United Kingdom, on British trade with Germany have already been addressed through the Foreign Office to the German Government at the instance of the Commercial Intelligence Committee of the Board of Trade. The matter will continue to be carefully watched.

Waltham Abbey Sanitary Inspector—Visits to Government Property.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will explain why the Sanitary Inspector at Waltham Abbey is not allowed to visit the Government houses and cottages, as well as the houses of private owners.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) Under Clause 327 of the Public Health Act of 1875 War Department property is exempted from disturbance or interference on the part of the Local Authority. It does not appear, moreover, that the local sanitary inspector has ever made any attempt to visit Government houses at Waltham.

Open Space in Palace Gardens.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can now state whether there is any chance of the piece of ground at the corner end of Palace Gardens being retained as an open space.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) The land north of the footpath to Church Street is let for the erection of seven detached houses of the same character as those already erected in the gardens. The small plot south of that path will be retained as an open space.

Education Schemes returned for alteration—Case of the Loughborough Town Council.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he will state in what respects the scheme under the Education Act, 1902, submitted to the Board of Education by the Loughborough Town Council did not comply with the requirements of the Act; why it was disapproved and returned by the Board of Education; and how many schemes submitted by councils have been returned for alterations.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) On 3rd March a scheme for an Education Committee was submitted to the Board of Education by the Loughborough Town Council. In the covering letter sent with the draft scheme it was suggested to the Board that the Chairman of the Education (Advisory) Committee and the Town Clerk would come to the Board for consultation as to various points in the scheme. As a result of that interview the Board communicated on the following day to the Town Council in writing the various suggestions made at the interview for improving the scheme (*a*) by securing the inclusion on the Committee of persons of more widely varied educational experience, and also (*b*) by making one or two drafting amendments to make the scheme more effectively carry out the intentions of the Council. These suggestions were adopted by the Town Council and publication of the scheme has now been sanctioned. I have said before in answer to questions addressed to me by the hon. Member that it is impossible to recount the communications which pass between the Board and local education authorities in the course of the formation of schemes.

Postal Facilities on the Continent.

MR. TOULMIN (Bury, Lancashire): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that arrangements exist between Germany and Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Germany and Switzerland, Austria, Bosnia, and Herzegovina and Switzerland, and Denmark and Norway and Sweden, whereby postal privileges superior to those of the Postal Union are secured, and that a letter from England which would cost 3s. 9d. is carried between the above-named countries for sums varying from 2½d. to 4d.; and whether he will consider the advisability of endeavouring to secure similar arrangements for this country.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I am aware that arrangements exist between the countries named in the Question under which the domestic rate of postage in each is applicable to correspondence passing from one to the other; but, as I have already informed the hon. Member in reply to a similar Question, I am not prepared to propose a general reduction of postage between the United Kingdom and foreign countries to our domestic rates.

Postal Officials as Candidates for Parliament.

MR. T. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): To ask the Postmaster General whether he is prepared to extend to officers of his own department the privilege allowed to officers of the naval and military forces of being placed on half-pay for the purposes of seeking election to Parliament, with the right of resuming their position in the service; if not, will he state what would be the position of an officer of the Postal Telegraph Department seeking and obtaining election to Parliament.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) By an Order in Council of the 29th November, 1884, any person serving in an established capacity in the permanent Civil Service of the State is bound to resign his office as soon as he issues his address to the electors or in any other manner announces himself as a candidate for a seat in this House.

Nominations for the Navy—Number of Vacancies.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state how many candidates will be nominated for the June examination for the Royal Navy, and what proportion this will bear to the number of vacancies available.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) Nominations for the candidates between 14½ and 15½ will bear about the same proportion to the vacancies as on the previous occasions. No final decision has been arrived at with regard to the exact number of candidates to be nominated for the Osborne College, but the nominations will only exceed the vacancies by a small number to allow for failures, as explained in my speech on Monday evening last.†

Vaccination—Costs of Executing Distress Warrants.

MR. LEVY: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that at Melton Mowbray on 19th January the police authorities, in executing three distress warrants for the recovery of fines and costs imposed under the Vaccination Acts, amounting respectively to 13s., 35s. 6d., and 40s. 6d., charged each defaulter, in addition to the usual fees, £4 7s. 6d. for the services of an auctioneer, and £1 8s. 4d. for the use of a van which in two of these instances was not used for any excepting purely police purposes; and whether he will consider the desirability of issuing such instructions to the chief constables throughout the country as will insure due regard for moderation in the execution of distress warrants under the Vaccination Acts.

---

† See page 935.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*) I have no information as to the particular cases mentioned in the Question, but I may say that the costs of enforcing such fines are properly charged to the defendants, and that the costs are necessarily increased when special police precautions are required. I do not think that I can properly issue to the police such instructions as the hon. Member suggests.

Increase of Pay to British Troops in India—Increase in Indian Budget.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for India how much of the £536,400 increased Army expenditure in the present Indian Budget is due to the increase of pay to the British troops in India.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) I have not received full details from India showing the cause of each increase and decrease of expenditure allowed for in the Budget; but, since the rate of pay of the British soldier in India is to be the same in 1903–4 as in 1902–3, no part of the increase to which the hon. Member draws attention can be due to the cause which he suggests. The chief increase owing to the new recruiting scheme will take effect from 1st April, 1904, and will have to be provided for a year hence in the Budget for 1904–5.

Guard Rooms—Improved Accommodation.

MR. COLSTON (Gloucestershire, Thornbury): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he can see his way to improve the sleeping accommodation of soldiers on guard in the intervals of the performance of their duties.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) A new pattern of guard bed is now on trial and is understood to give general satisfaction.

South African War Medals for American Nurses on Hospital Ship "Maine."

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that the American orderlies and male nurses on the hospital ship "Maine" have received the war medal for their services to our sick and wounded in South Africa and China, he will state why the five certificated American female nurses in charge have been refused the medal.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Instructions were despatched to principal Ordnance officer, Woolwich, on 13th instant, to issue these medals.

Ireland—Burtonport Extension Railway Charges.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any, and, if so, what steps have been taken to secure that reasonable rates and fares only shall be charged on the Burtonport Extension Railway recently built out of public moneys and leased to the Lough Swilly Railway Company.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The extent to which the new department can intervene in such matters is defined by Section 17 of The Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899. No representations have been made to the department under the provisions of this section.

Committees and Commissions now Sitting.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will give a list of the subjects of public interest now being investigated, or to be investigated, by Committees, departmental and otherwise, and Royal Commissions.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The hon. Member will find in the Estimates for Temporary Commissions a list of the Commissions now sitting. Announcement has already been made of Royal Commissions in respect of the following matters, viz., the St. Louis Exhibition, Food Supply in time of War, and the Militia and Volunteer Services. The lists of Select Committees appointed by the House are printed and posted in conspicuous places in the House of Commons. In addition to the foregoing, a public promise has been made of an inquiry into the constitution and functions of the Board of Trade and the

Local Government Board; but it would not be in accordance with practice, or, indeed, in the public interest, to publish a list of the various departmental committees which from time to time are held in Government Offices. These inquiries frequently relate to questions of administrative detail, and are of a confidential character.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Army Commissions.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, if he will grant the Return as to the number of Commissions granted during each of the years 1899–1902.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): Yes, Sir.

Training Ships on the East Coast.

MR. FREDERICK WILSON (Norfolk, Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, whether, in view of the seafaring population of the East Coast, he will consider the expediency of a training ship being stationed at Great Yarmouth.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): There are already two training ships on the East Coast, namely at Harwich and Queensferry. The interests of the Service do not at present require the addition of another ship.

South Africa—Native Labour Question.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can inform the House of the nature of the Conference of the South African Colonies on Native Labour, and how the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies and the Protectorates are represented.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The Conference was summoned primarily to discuss Customs questions, but it was agreed between all parties before the meeting that the native question and the question of alien immigration should be discussed at the same time. Other matters of general South African interest may be also included, but only if all parties to the Conference have agreed. The Cape, Natal, Transvaal, Orange River Colony and Rhodesia are each represented by five Members nominated by their respective Governments. The Transvaal and Orange River Colony have each nominated two official and three unofficial Members. The Protectorates may be regarded as represented by the fact that the High Commissioner is in the Chair.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, N.R., Cleveland): Can the right hon. Gentleman say when the Conference is likely to report?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No.

South African Shipping Ring.

MR. PEEL (Manchester, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether it is the practice of the Colonial Office, in obtaining tenders through their brokers for the carriage of goods between this country and South Africa and *vice versâ*, to invite firms outside the Shipping Conference to quote; and, if so, will he give the names of firms so invited during the last six months.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The Colonial Office transacts no shipping business. The Crown Agents for the Colonies undertake business of this description on behalf of the Colonial Governments for whom they act and to whom they are responsible for its conduct. In ordinary circumstances the Crown Agents employ a shipping agent in the City to obtain offers for the freight they desire to secure and the shipping agent is responsible for obtaining the best terms possible. In the present condition of the South African shipping market, it is impossible to entertain tenders from firms outside the Conference Lines, unless there is a certainty that those firms will be able in the future to provide the requisite shipping facilities. The acceptance of a casual outside tender would place the Crown Agents, or any other shipper absolutely at the mercy of the Conference.

Mr. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that an agent in the City cannot ship by the Conference lines and by the outside lines?

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes.

Distribution of the West Indies Relief Fund.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the £250,000 granted by Parliament in July last for the relief of the West Indies has been distributed; and, if so, what amount has been apportioned to each Colony, and on what principle the distribution has taken place.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The following distribution of the grant has been made:—Barbadoes, £80,000; British Guiana, £69,000; Jamaica, £10,000; Trinidad, £41,000; St. Lucia, £3,000; Antigua, £13,500; St. Kitts-Nevis, £4,100; Montserrat, £600. A sum of £18,800 remains as yet unappropriated, but will probably be mainly allotted to Antigua. In distributing the grant, regard has been had to the relative necessities of the several Colonies, and to their average exports of sugar.

Mr. LOUGH: Was the distribution made exclusively to the owners of sugar estates?

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir.

Private Bill Committees.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the right hon. Member for the Watford Division, as Chairman of the Committee of Selection, if he is now prepared to state in how many cases during the last and preceding years Members asked to be excused serving on Private Bill Committees on the ground of private profession, business, or avocation; and in how many such cases they were excused; whether, when so excused, it was on the general ground of the peculiar nature of the Member's profession, or of special inconvenience that would be caused at the particular time when the name was placed on the Panel; and if he can say how many hon. Members belonging to the so-called learned professions in active practice, served on Private Bill Committees in 1901 and 1902 respectively.

*Mr. HALSEY (Hertfordshire, Watford): I can only give the same answer that I gave to a similar Question on a previous occasion.† I am unable to state the number of cases, but each application was most carefully considered on its own merits by the Committee of Selection. The object of the Committee is, and always has been, to select those Members best qualified, in their judgment, for the work of each Committee, and at the same time to carry out their duties with as little inconvenience as possible to individual Members.

Death Duties on Licensed Property.

Sir W. HART DYKE (Kent, Dartford): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that Death Duties have been paid upon licensed property at the rate of eighteen years purchase in the case of freehold, and of sixteen years for leasehold property; and that notice has been immediately given to terminate the said licences the following year; and whether he can suggest any remedy for such a state of things.

*The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon): Under Section 7 (5) of the Finance Act, 1894, the basis of valuation for Estate Duty is the price which the property would fetch if sold in the open market at the time of the death of the deceased. This principle is applied to licensed property, and if, as not infrequently happens, the executors dispose of the property shortly after the death, then the actual value realised is taken. The capital value in such cases bears very varying relations to the annual rental. Of course the probability or otherwise of a house remaining a licensed house is a governing element in determining the value. If in any case a licence is withdrawn immediately or soon after the death of the owner of the premises, and the estate is still under administration, the Board of Inland Revenue would always be open to consider an application for readjustment of the value put upon the licensed property for Estate Duty.

---

†See (4) *Debates*, ci., 1106.

Sugar and Corn Taxes.

MR. LOUGH: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the total number of articles which have been made liable to Customs Duties under the Sugar Tax and the Corn Tax respectively, the number of prosecutions for smuggling any of these articles initiated by the Government, and the amount of penalties that have been recovered.

*MR. RITCHIE: The articles liable to the Corn and Sugar Duties are those specified in the Finance Acts, together with such other goods as may be found to contain any of these dutiable articles as a part or ingredient, as provided in sub-section 1 of section 7 of the Finance Act, 1901. There have been no prosecutions by the Customs for smuggling goods liable to the Sugar and Corn Duties, except in respect of saccharin. Five such cases have been carried to completion, resulting in the recovery in two instances of mitigated penalties of £125 and £25 respectively. Of the remaining three cases one defendant is still in prison pending payment, and in the other two the defendants have been released after undergoing terms of imprisonment. In addition, there are five cases in which proceedings have not yet been brought to a conclusion.

MR. LOUGH: The right hon. Gentleman has not given me the number of articles liable under each head. That is the object of my Question.

*MR. RITCHIE: There is no fixed number. There is a specified class, and any goods which come in and which the Customs authorities think are dutiable are open to a charge of duty.

MR. LOUGH: Is there no certainty, then, about an article beforehand, and may it not be free to-day and liable to duty to-morrow?

*MR. RITCHIE: No; the same article which is not liable to-day will not be liable to-morrow, but any article which turns out to have any ingredient in it which is taxable will be taxed.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): The right hon. Gentleman's predecessor gave us a schedule of the list of articles taxable under these Acts. Are we to understand that the schedule has been increased?

MR. RITCHIE: No, Sir; if my hon. friend will refer to the schedule he will see that it is a statement of classes only. There may be sub-divisions of the classes according to circumstances.

King's Scholarships.

MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he will consider the advisability of rescinding the regulation preventing information being given as to the marks obtained by candidates for King's Scholarships who fail to obtain a place in the second class.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): The marks obtained by individual candidates in the King's Scholarship Examination have never been published up till the year 1900 inclusive; the list was arranged in such a way as to show which candidates obtained exactly the same number of marks. In the year 1901 this arrangement was given up in favour of a system of bracketing candidates in divisions of equal merit within each class. After careful consideration the Board of Education are of opinion that the system has great advantages over that previously in force, as it avoids attempts to discriminate between the merits of candidates whose marks only differ very slightly, and they are of opinion that to publish the exact number of marks obtained by each candidate would be of no real value to the candidate and of no advantage to the conduct of the examinations.

Sheep Worrying in Scotland.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if he can state when he expects to be able to introduce a Bill dealing with sheep worrying in Scotland.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): I hope to introduce a Bill before Easter.

Parcels Post Rates.

MR. STUART SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether, in view of the fact that parcels can be sent by parcels post to Bremen and from there by the German post to America at a less cost than direct from England, he will consider the desirability of making arrangements to place British merchants on an equal footing with Germans in this respect.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): It has long been the desire of the British Post Office to conclude a parcels post agreement with the United States, but we were unable to secure their assent to any such proposal. We therefore made arrangements last year with an Express Company for the establishment of a parcels post between the two countries. The United States recently expressed a desire to reopen negotiations on the subject, and His Majesty's Government are now in communication with them upon the subject.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: Has the Postmaster-General's attention been called to the delays in the deliveries by the Express Company in New York?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Wages in the Post Office.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been drawn to the remarks made by Mr. Justice Phillimore when directing the grand jury at the opening of the Glamorgan Assizes, in which he animadverted on the low wages paid to five Post Office employees who were to be tried, and expressed the hope that the Post Office authorities would consider this state of things; and whether he proposes taking any action in the matter.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: As these cases have not yet been adjudicated upon, I must ask the hon. Member to postpone his Question. When the cases are finished, I shall be prepared to answer the Question.

Post Offices on Licensed Premises.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he will grant a Parliamentary Return of post offices on licensed premises in the United Kingdom at the present time.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Such a return could not be prepared without a considerable amount of trouble, which would not, I think, be justified by the results obtained, but I may say at once that it is the settled practice of the department to secure, wherever possible, unlicensed premises for the transaction of postal business.

Aberdeen New Post Office.

MR. PIRIE: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can state how long it is intended to take for the completion of the post office buildings in Aberdeen; and whether, seeing that only £7,500 was taken in the Estimates for 1902–3, and £10,000 for 1903–4, out of a proposed expenditure of over £52,000, he would consider the desirability of taking a further Supplementary Estimate this year to expedite the work.

MR. AILWYN FELLOWES (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): The date fixed in the contract for the completion of the work is 11th November, 1905. The First Commissioner of Works is advised that there is difficulty in the way of obtaining supplies of suitable granite for the external elevations; but the contractors have a sufficient number of workmen to deal with the stone delivered. It is not anticipated that more than £10,000 can be spent in 1903–4. It must be remembered that, owing to the deduction of the contract reserves, this payment will represent a far larger amount of work done.

Irish Training Colleges.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant the Return relating to Training Colleges in Ireland which appears on this day's Paper.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I am communicating to the hon. Member the figures indicated in the proposed Return. This, I hope, will meet the object he has in view. The information does not appear to me to be of sufficient importance to be embodied in a Parliamentary Paper.

White Estate near Bantry.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork Co., W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain the delay in the sale of the White Estate (near Bantry); and whether, seeing that this estate was listed for sale in 1898, he will take steps to expedite its disposal to the tenants.

MR. WYNDHAM: The solicitors having charge of the sale of this estate have been required by the Land Judge to explain the delay in the proceedings.

Primary Education in Ireland.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether it has been decided to allocate to primary education in Ireland the sum of £146,250, being the equivalent grant in view of £1,300,000, allocated to England by the Education Act of 1902; and, if so, whether its disbursements will be at the disposal of the Commissioners of National Education, or will portions of it be ear-marked for special purposes.

MR. WYNDHAM: I expect shortly to make an announcement on this subject.

Irish Teachers' Capitation Grant.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the capitation grant due to National teachers on the 31st December of each year is not paid until the middle or end of the following April, and if he will give instructions for this money to be paid when due.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Question presumably refers to the payment of what is known as the residue of the School Grant. The amount of this residue in respect of any year cannot be accurately determined till the end of each financial year. The School Grant accruing from the 1st January to the 31st December last, which forms part of the consolidated incomes of teachers, is paid out of the money voted for the current financial year, so far as the allocation under the first three provisions of the fourth schedule of the Act of 1892 is concerned, and so far as the residual grant is concerned from the Vote for the next financial year. Hence payment of the residue for the year ended 31st December last cannot be ascertained and made till next month.

Employment of Children Bill.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, when it is proposed to proceed with the Second Reading of the Employment of Children Bill.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I hope an opportunity may be found for it on an early day, at all events before Easter; but I fear I cannot fix the actual day.

The Budget.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether the Budget will be introduced before Easter; and, if so, on what day.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Not before Easter.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I should like to ask the First Lord if he can give me an indication what Bills it is proposed to take on Monday and Tuesday next, if there is time; and when the House will rise for the Easter recess.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As the House knows it is proposed on Monday afternoon to take the Report of the Navy Votes A and 1, and Votes 13 and 15. I do not think it is very likely that on that afternoon much leisure will remain for legislation. In the evening it is proposed to take the report of the Vote on Account; also the report of Ways and Means and the first reading of the Consolidated Fund Bill. I do not think much else can be done. On Tuesday afternoon the second reading of the Consolidated Fund Bill will be taken. Any question may be raised on that, and I do not think much time will be left for legislation on Tuesday afternoon. On Wednesday afternoon it is proposed to take the Committee stage of the Consolidated Fund Bill. On that no debate can take place, and it is proposed to allocate that afternoon to the introduction of the Irish Land Bill. On Thursday the Third Reading of the Consolidated Fund Bill will be taken at the afternoon sitting, and after that Supply. As to Supply I should be glad to know what Votes hon. Gentlemen would like brought on. On Thursday there can be no question of legislation. It is a Supply day.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Is it intended to move the Speaker out of the Chair on the Civil Service Estimates before Easter?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, I should think that the motion that the Speaker leave the Chair for going into Committee on the Civil Service Estimates should be made before Easter.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Then as there are some motions down of a very important character I hope the right hon. Gentleman will give us as long notice as possible.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, I will take care to give a few days notice, I have not yet worked out in detail the programme before the Easter holidays. It is a little premature to say on what date the House ought to separate. The question is an agreeable subject of reflection.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): Will Thursday next be considered a counted day for Supply?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The business is Supply. It is not for me to interpret the rules.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) asked whether it was not a fact that under the new rules Supply must be the first order of the day, and that the Bill must, consequently, be put second. Is it proposed to introduce the Irish Land Bill in the House or in Committee?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In the House.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Then what about the Standing Orders?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I must have notice about the Standing Orders. I cannot carry them in my head.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

Ordered, that all Standing Committees have leave to print and circulate with the Votes the Minutes of their Proceedings and any Amended Clauses of Bills committed to them.—(*Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice*).

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Charles Frederick Hutchinson, esquire, M.D., for the County of Sussex (Eastern or Rye Division.)

NEW BILLS.

ADDENBROOKE'S HOSPITAL BILL.

"To confirm a scheme of the Charity Commissioners for the management of the Charity called Addenbrooke's Hospital, in the town of Cambridge, in the county of Cambridge, regulated by the Act of the seventh year of George the Third, chapter ninety-nine," presented by Sir Richard Jebb; supported by Mr. Brand, Sir Robert Penrose-Fitz-Gerald, Sir John Gorst, Mr. Raymond Greene, Mr. Griffith-Boscawen, and Mr. Rose; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 22nd April, and to be printed. [Bill 110.]

STREET TRAFFIC REGULATION BILL

"To provide for the Regulation of Traffic in Streets," presented by Mr. Shackleton; supported by Mr. Crooks; to be read a second time upon Friday, 8th May, and to be printed. [Bill 111.]

PETROLEUM BILL.

"To amend the Petroleum Act, 1879," presented by Mr. Ure; supported by

Colonel Denny, Mr. John Burns, and Mr. Trevelyan; to be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 112.]

SOLICITORS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To amend the law relating to Solicitors in Scotland," presented by Mr. Ure; supported by Mr. Renshaw and Mr. Crombie; to be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 113.]

WAYS AND MEANS.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR formally moved, "That the Committee of Ways and Means be not interrupted this evening under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House), and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed."

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said that the second part of the Motion brought it within the ordinary Rules of the House and enabled it to be debated. He was aware that the time at the disposal of the Government was short, and that very necessary things required to be done. He did not, therefore, propose to argue against the Resolution. But he did desire to remind the House that the privilege which it had enjoyed for centuries of moving Amendments to the Motion that the Speaker leave the chair on going into Committee of Ways and Means had been withdrawn this year. He rose now merely to assert the right of the House to debate a Motion of this kind.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) agreed that when the House for the first time entered on a Motion of this kind since the remodelling of the Standing Orders, it was desirable that the occasion should not pass without remark. He regretted that the Prime Minister had not vouchsafed to the House some reason for making the Motion. The right hon. Gentleman was getting too much into the habit of making these Motions as if they were a matter of course, and he trusted that in future when the exigencies of the public service rendered such a Motion necessary, a few words of explanation would be given them.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am extremely flattered by the anxiety of the hon. Member to hear my oratory—I should have thought it is displayed sufficiently often to the House. The reason I did not explain the Motion is that it does not require explanation. We cannot finish our financial business for the year unless we introduce the Consolidated Fund Bill on Monday, and we cannot do that unless we get through the Ways and Means Committee Stage to-night, otherwise we shall have to interfere with the private Members' privileges on Friday.

Ordered, That the Committee of Ways and Means be not interrupted this evening under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House), and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed.—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

SUPPLY [2ND ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Civil Services and Revenue Departments Estimates, 1903–4 (Vote on Account).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £20,265,000, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for or towards defraying the Charges for the following Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904, viz.—

Civil Services.

	£
CLASS II.	
Colonial Office - - -	25,000
CLASS IV.	
Board of Education - -	6,000,000
CLASS II.	
Board of Agriculture - -	65,000
CLASS III.	
Crofters Commission, Scotland	2,000

CLASS I.

	£
Royal Palaces and Marlborough House - - - -	40,000
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens - - - -	50,000
Houses of Parliament Buildings - - - -	16,000
Miscellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain - - -	30,000
Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain - - -	20,000
Diplomatic and Consular Buildings - - - -	18,000
Revenue Buildings - - -	225,000
Public Buildings, Great Britain	225,000
Surveys of the United Kingdom - - - -	90,000
Harbours under the Board of Trade - - - -	7,000
Peterhead Harbour - -	6,000
Rates on Government Property	250,000
Public Works and Buildings, Ireland - - - -	110,000
Railways, Ireland - - -	80,000

CLASS II.

United Kingdom and England :—

House of Lords Offices - -	2,000
House of Commons Offices -	12,000
Treasury and Subordinate Departments - - -	40,000
Home Office - - - -	60,000
Foreign Office - - -	30,000
Privy Council Office, etc. -	5,000
Board of Trade - - -	75,000
Mercantile Marine Services -	30,000
Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade - -	3
Charity Commission - -	15,000
Civil Service Commission -	18,000
Exchequer and Audit Department - - - -	25,000
Friendly Societies Registry -	3,000
Local Government Board -	85,000
Lunacy Commission - -	5,000
Mint (including Coinage) -	5
National Debt Office - -	6,000
Public Record Office - -	10,000
Public Works Loan Commission - - - -	5
Registrar General's Office -	19,000
Stationery and Printing - -	320,000
Woods, Forests, etc., Office of	8,000
Works and Public Buildings, Office of - - - -	30,000
Secret Service - - -	40,000

Scotland :—

	£
Secretary for Scotland - -	25,000
Fishery Board - -	8,000
Lunacy Commission - - -	3,000
Registrar General's Office -	5,000
Local Government Board - -	6,000

Ireland :—

Lord Lieutenant's Household -	2,000
Chief Secretary for Ireland -	16,000
Department of Agriculture -	75,000
Charitable Donations and Bequests Office - - -	1,000
Local Government Board - -	25,000
Public Record Office - - -	2,000
Public Works Office - - -	18,000
Registrar General's Office - -	6,000
Valuation and Boundary Survey	7,000

CLASS III.

United Kingdom and England :—

Law Charges - - - -	35,000
Miscellaneous Legal Expenses -	27,000
Supreme Court of Judicature -	140,000
Land Registry - - - -	20,000
County Courts - - - -	8,000
Police, England and Wales -	18,000
Prisons, England and the Colonies - - - -	340,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain -	140,000
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum - - - -	14,000

Scotland :—

Law Charges and Courts of Law	30,000
Register House, Edinburgh -	15,000
Prisons, Scotland - - -	40,000

Ireland :—

Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions - - - -	35,000
Supreme Court of Judicature, and other Legal Departments - - - -	45,000
Land Commission - - -	55,000
County Court Officers, etc. -	46,000
Dublin Metropolitan Police -	45,000
Royal Irish Constabulary - -	600,000
Prisons, Ireland - - -	50,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools - - - -	55,000
Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum - - - -	3,000

CLASS IV.

United Kingdom and England:—

	£
British Museum	80,000
National Gallery	10,000
National Portrait Gallery	3,000
Wallace Collection	4,000
Scientific Investigation, etc., United Kingdom	22,000
Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales	42,000

Scotland:—

Public Education	750,000
National Gallery	3,000

Ireland:—

Public Education	730,000
Endowed School Commissioners	400
National Gallery	3,000
Queen's Colleges	2,500

CLASS V.

Diplomatic and Consular Services	250,000
Uganda, Central and East Africa Protectorates, and Uganda Railway	320,000
Colonial Services	300,000
Cyprus, Grant-in-Aid	85,000
Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable	32,000

CLASS VI

Superannuation and Retired Allowances	280,000
Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, etc.	2,000
Miscellaneous, Charitable and other Allowances	1,000
Hospitals and Charities, Ireland	17,000

CLASS VII.

Temporary Commissions	25,000
Miscellaneous Expenses	16,087
Repayments to the Local Loans Fund	— —
St. Louis Exhibition, 1904	— —
Total for Civil Services	£13,035,000

Revenue Departments.

	£
Customs	350,000
Inland Revenue	830,000
Post Office	3,800,000
Post Office Packet Service	250,000
Post Office Telegraphs	2,000,000
Total for Revenue Departments	£7,230,000
Grand Total	£20,265,000

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said he did not rise to start any debate upon the Colonial Vote, though he was glad to see the Colonial Secretary had not suffered in health from his travels by land and sea and was apparently quite ready to enter upon such a debate. The Colonial Vote had been put down first, not at the request of the hon. Members on that side of the House, but because the Government very properly thought that the House should have the earliest opportunity of expressing an opinion or of putting questions upon a subject in which it was deeply interested—the state of affairs in South Africa. Whether the right hon. Gentleman himself desired to make a statement was not known to him, but there was a general desire for a full discussion on many important matters connected with our South African policy. The House, however, at present, was without the materials which alone would enable it to usefully embark on such a discussion. The Colonial Secretary, in the course of his visit to South Africa, had many interviews, some public and some private, as to which their only source of information was newspaper correspondence, and until, in relation to these, the House had more information than had been made known, it was not in a position to express any opinion on the right hon. Gentleman's views or on any decision at which the Government might have arrived. It would be well not to embark on an imperfect, ill-informed discussion; and he rose for the purpose of asking the right hon. Gentleman in what form he proposed to give the information it was generally agreed was required. Even if the right hon. Gentleman's speeches were all printed it would not be sufficient because it was quite clear, that he must have said many things in a tentative way. The speeches, too, did not necessarily embody the formal decisions arrived at. He took it there must have been some record kept of the decisions arrived at. Could they not have that placed in their hands. He would like, too, some information in the shape of figures.

It would perhaps, be as well for him to enumerate the points upon which information was desired. The first of these had relation to the question of native labour, and the various suggestions made for the importation of labour, or for giving forcible inducement to the natives to work. He would like to know if the Government had come to any decision, and, if so, what decision. He would also like to know what was to be done with regard to taxation of the natives. The next subject was that of loans, and the question was what portion of the loan of £35,000,000 would be applied to the satisfaction of existing obligations, and what portion would be devoted to railway and other public works. The second loan, proposed to meet the expenses of the war, was discussed at Johannesburg, and he desired to know the terms arrived at, and what certainty there was that the rest of the loan, over and above the ten millions underwritten, would be raised. Were there any other conditions beyond those already made public attached to the transaction, and who were the persons with whom the right hon. Gentleman dealt? Next he wished to know what was the financial position in regard to the disposal of public land in the new territories and a plan of assisted emigration. The gold laws, the form of contribution from old and new mines, the amount of revenue, and the prospect of it being sufficient to bear various charges at present borne by this country, were other matters of interest.

This did not exhaust the many points of interest arising, upon which he did not anticipate there would be objection on the part of the Government to give the information at their disposal. The Papers presented within the last few months could not convey the latest opinion of the Government, and they perhaps might desire some consideration as to the form in which the necessary material for discussion should be presented. He hoped he had made it clear to the House that this was not a convenient moment for entering on the debate owing to the lack of material on which to form an opinion. All he desired to have from the Government was an assurance that, as soon as possible, adequate material should be forthcoming, and that then they would be allowed a full opportunity of discussing various questions, the importance of which, to the future of South Africa, it was impossible to overestimate.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I do not rise to answer in any fulness the questions of the right hon. Gentleman, but merely to deal briefly with the question of procedure he has raised. The view of the Government was that, my recent mission to South Africa having come to an end, the House might very naturally desire to make some remarks on anything that has taken place, or to ask further information as to incidents that occurred in the course of that mission. Therefore, they offered, as I understand with the full assent and almost the desire of right hon. Gentlemen opposite, to put down the Colonial Vote first on this occasion. But if right hon. Gentlemen opposite do not wish to take advantage of the opportunity, nothing can be easier than to allow the debate to die away and to take such further opportunity, as may suggest itself to them, for any discussion in which the House may be pleased to engage. The right hon. Gentleman, however, appears to be under some misunderstanding when he talks of lack of materials. I made arrangements with Lord Milner that reports should be made upon the main subjects, that is to say, immigration, railways, finance, the constitution of the legislature, and other matters of very great importance, which I could present in Blue-book form to the House. Those Papers have not yet reached me, but Lord Milner telegraphs that they are on their way. As soon as they arrive they shall be presented, and I have no doubt they will give a great deal of new and interesting information to the House of Commons. But as regards my tour, I have no additional materials to furnish.

The right hon. Gentleman appears to think that I have come to a vast number of decisions which have not yet been communicated to the House. That is not the case. It is quite true that in addition to my public work, I think, I saw something like 150 deputations, and had personal communications and interviews with something like 500 representative men of all parties and of various shades of opinion. My object in having those interviews was, as I said when I started on my journey, to inform my own mind with regard to the various questions with which the Government hereafter may have to deal. All of those interviews, and most of the deputations, were private, and there is no information whatever to communicate to the House in regard to them. Where they resulted in a decision, that decision has already been communicated to the House, not officially, perhaps, but through the ordinary channels. Those decisions are, I think, confined to two, viz. the question of the loan dealing with the indemnities, and the way in which the Government propose to deal with the claims for compensation, and with the receipts and promises made by the military authorities. Only with regard to those two, I believe, has any definite decision been arrived at.

The right hon. Gentleman refers, for instance, to the question of native labour. No proposals were made with regard to native labour, except a minor one that I should use my influence with the Foreign Office to allow an experiment to be made in certain districts which have not hitherto been utilised for the purpose, and to see whether native labour could be obtained from those districts. I understand that, as a result, my noble friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs is prepared to give authority to allow 1000 natives to be recruited in Central Africa, as an experiment, for service in the mines. That is, I believe, absolutely the sole result of our proceedings hitherto, and the only decision which has been arrived at. As regards the two points upon which a decision has been arrived at, I am quite prepared to give the fullest explanation to the House. But as regards the loan, I can conceive that it might be thought more advisable that that matter should be discussed when the Bill comes before the House.

MR. BRYCE: The right hon. Gentleman refers to the £35,000,000 loan? There is also the question of the other loan.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: To both. When the £35,000,000 loan is discussed, I think it would be a proper occasion for considering also the question of the £30,000,000. In the meantime I might say, in reply to one suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman, that the arrangement for the loan is to be taken as absolutely confined to that arrangement; it is not connected with, or related to, or conditional upon any other arrangement of any kind whatever, either direct or indirect.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): When will the Bill come on?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: After Easter. The question of the gold law, on which I heard a great deal in South Africa, is not one on which I can be called upon to pronounce any opinion. A draft gold law has been prepared, and will be laid before the new Legislative Council, which I hope may meet in the course of the present month or next month. There has been some difficulty in getting the nominated members whom we wished to place upon that body, but when it is completed an early meeting will be called, and the gold law will be one of the first measures referred to it.

I do not quite understand what the right hon. Gentleman means by assisted immigration. There is no proposal, as far as I know, to assist immigration by the Government of this country, and no proposal to assist immigration by the Government of the Transvaal, except by the favourable terms on which land will probably be obtainable in the new Colonies.

MR. BRYCE: There was a suggestion that the Government were buying land with a view to selling it to settlers.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The whole question of land settlement, to which I attach the greatest importance, is one which will be dealt with in the reports which are coming home from Lord Milner.

Another point is with regard to compensation, and what I may call the eleemosynary grant under the terms of peace, and the payments in accordance with the promises of the military. The House is aware that by the terms of peace the sum of £3,000,000 was allotted as a free gift in order to provide those who were destitute, on returning to their homes, with the essentials requisite to enable them to resume their avocation. In accordance with that provision a considerable sum of money has already been expended in connection with the work of repatriation, which has been going on in a manner which is perfectly marvellous, and which reflects the greatest possible credit upon Lord Milner and all concerned. Since the war something like 100,000 have been repatriated upon their farms, kept there so long as it was necessary by the supply of rations, and assisted with stock and material; and now, for the most part, are in process of restoring their fortunes.

Beside the £3,000,000, a further grant of £2,000,000 was made by the House of Commons to be applied to those who had assisted the British Government—British subjects who also had suffered in the course of the war. In addition to that, large sums have been spent in resettlement and repatriation; and beyond all there remain the claims—partly claims of grace, but principally claims of right—due to the promises made by the military while they were in occupation; that is to say—as the military went about the country they had very often to requisition stock of various kinds, and also material, and for these they gave receipts which have now to be honoured. Already a sum of nearly £2,000,000—£1,600,000 or more—has been paid out in return for these receipts, and I hope that the rest of the money will be distributed in the course of the next few weeks.

But a much wider liability is due to those proclamations which promised protection to the men who surrendered before the end of the war. The claims under this head have been very numerous, amounting, I believe, to something like 100,000, and have involved enormous demands. Of course, in such a case, as may be well understood, these applications have had to be subjected to a very narrow scrutiny. The process, as long as it remained in the hands of military commissions, was much delayed. A military commission was by the necessities of the case, owing to military emergencies, a changing body. Its chairman might be summoned home or sent on other work, and a new man have to be appointed. The heads of some of these commissions have been changed three or four times in the course of as many months. In these circumstances it was most difficult to act according to any settled principle. The difficulties which arose in dealing with such a vast variety of cases were found to be extremely great, while at the same time the operations of the civil commission, which had to deal with the two grants to which I have referred, were delayed until they could tell how far the persons who were applying for assistance were likely to derive that assistance from military funds. Accordingly, after discussing the matter fully with the General Commanding-in-Chief and with Lord Milner, we prepared and submitted to the Government a scheme under which the whole of the future administration of all moneys to be granted in the shape of either free gift, compensation, or payment on receipts, should be placed under the control of the civil administration. The War Office agreed to pay down a net sum of £3,000,000 in discharge of all demands upon the military authorities, and the civil Government of the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony has undertaken to bear the whole charge whether it be more or less, with this proviso—that if it be less, which I do not think is at all likely to be the case, the balance will be returned to the military authorities. The advantage of that arrangement I think the House will at once perceive. It will secure the uniform administration of the whole business; and it will place the administration in the hands of those who have to consider policy as well as economy. The military authorities naturally felt it to be their duty to reduce these charges as much as possible, and in some instances I confess I have been impressed with the conviction that the rules laid down did not carry out in full the promises which had been made, and it would be most impolitic to insist upon such rules. But the civil administration, which has to look to the future pacification and contentment of the people, will no doubt take a just and generous view of the situation and be prepared to deal with these claims in a way which, on the whole, I believe, will be satisfactory. I had an immense number of representations of all kinds made to me during my visit, showing the extraordinary variety of the claims, and the difficulty of laying down rules, and, as a result of those communications, new regulations have been laid down and new Commissions are now at work with every expectation that whereas, if we had left it in the hands of the military authorities, the work would have taken three or four years; it will now be completed in the course of the next few months. When that difficulty is removed from our path I have not the slightest doubt whatever as to the favourable prospects of the agricultural portion of the population in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony.

In the meantime I have to acknowledge the co-operation which a great number of the Boers have given to the Government in their efforts to deal with this difficult matter. Some of those who fought against us to the end have joined and worked upon the repatriation and settlement Boards, and their action upon those Boards has elicited from their British colleagues expressions of the highest admiration. On the other hand, we ought to do nothing which would tend to pauperise the population. Therefore they have joined with us in dealing with the claims which have been made in a firm and just, as well as a sympathetic spirit. I think that will give the right hon. Gentleman the information which he desires as regards the points which were settled during my journey. As regards the rest, I have only to add that I am still ready to deal with any incident in that journey, or to give, as far as lies in my power, any information to the House which it may desire, in regard either to the matters which the right hon. Gentleman touched upon, or in regard to any others that arise in regard to our future administration in South Africa. I certainly do not feel that any good purpose would be served by my undertaking to read a lecture to the House on my journey and travels in the South African continent.

Mr. ASQUITH: I wish at once to say that it was not in consequence of any request from this side of the House that this Vote was put down first, because, until we have fuller and more authentic information, we cannot review the whole of the ground which is necessary to enable us to come to a decision. I understand that it is only in respect of two points that actual decisions were arrived at during the time the right hon. Gentleman was in South Africa.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Except, of course, on points of ordinary administration.

Mr. ASQUITH: One of the decisions relates to the resettlement, and the other to the loans. As regards the loans, I understand that we shall have a full opportunity of discussing them when the Bills are introduced after Easter. I will, therefore, only make one remark. I am glad to hear that the loans will be dealt with entirely independently of any other question connected with the general settlement in South Africa; and that they will be discussed exclusively on their merits. As regards almost all the rest of the subjects which have formed the text of the interrogation of the right hon. Gentleman, it is quite plain that until we get the information he has promised us, it is impossible to have anything in the nature of a complete or exhaustive discussion. I should like to know, and the country would like to know, from the right hon. Gentleman or Lord Milner, how far the bodies who are at present entrusted with legislative authority in these two colonies contain a representative element, and what progress is contemplated as likely to be made, within a measurable distance of time, in the development of self-governing institutions. I think that is a matter upon which, even at the present stage, the right hon. Gentleman might, perhaps, give us a little more information.

Sir JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said he rose for the purpose of asking a question. He understood from the Secretary of State that a decision had been come to by His Majesty's Government that natives should be recruited in Central Africa. The recruiting of natives in Central Africa for the purposes of labour in the Transvaal gold mines required to be most carefully safeguarded unless it was to sink into virtual slavery. In the case of the recruiting in India of coolies for service in the sugar plantations, most elaborate regulations were made by the Government of India for the purpose of securing their proper treatment during the time they were working for white employers, and provision was also made for their repatriation in India when their term of service had come to an end. He desired to know whether the regulations under which the recruiting of natives would take place would be laid on the Table of the House, in order that the country might judge whether they were sufficient to preserve the rights of the natives and to prevent, under the cloak of recruiting, the real curse of slavery.

MR. A. BLACK (Banffshire) said the debate seemed to be more or less in the nature of a catechism, and he had another question to ask about the language. He understood from the right hon. Gentleman that only two questions had been decided, namely, the question of the loans and the question of compensation. From a statement made yesterday he also understood that the language question had been decided upon.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The orders with regard to education were passed before I went to South Africa. The other matter which the hon. Member is now referring to was the subject of an absolutely private conversation, and to that conversation I should not like to make any further reference.

MR. BLACK: But the right hon. Gentleman made reference to it in this House in reply to a Question.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, I only contradicted a statement in regard to it.

MR. BLACK said the right hon. Gentleman had laid great stress upon the question of compensation, and he had also alluded to the rights created by proclamation. He wished to know what proclamation was alluded to. Did the right hon. Gentleman mean the proclamation annexing the Republic, and did he consider this country liable for damage done by the military forces after that proclamation was issued? After the Franco-German war the French Government compensated all parties for damage done by the military, whether done by their own soldiers or by the Germans. The question was whether, in annexing these territories, they did not make those territories themselves liable for all this compensation. With regard to compensation, the right hon. Gentleman mentioned that in addition to the grant of £3,000,000, the military receipts were to be respected, and the £3,000,000 was to be set apart for further compensation. A further £2,000,000 appeared in the Estimates this year, and he wished to know if this was in addition to the £3,000,000 already provided for. The right hon. Gentleman said that he had come to no decisions in South Africa, but he was inclined to think that it would have been very difficult for the right hon. Gentleman to have spoken so often as he did without announcing some decisions. At Pietermaritzburg the right hon. Gentleman stated that it was obvious that full self-government would not be granted until three conditions were fulfilled. In the first place he said that self-government would not be given until active loyalty, as against passive loyalty, had been shown; secondly, until the Colony should undertake its own defence; and thirdly, until the guarantee loan was paid off. It seemed to him that in giving that decision the right hon. Gentleman vitiated the whole concern. They would like to know what he meant by these conditions of self-government. With regard to native labour, had the right hon. Gentleman heard anything from the native women about their hardships directly, or was it from the Johannesburg millionaires that he heard of the grievances in regard to these native women?

With regard to these loans, the Member for East Fife had stated quite properly that full discussion upon this subject might very well be delayed until the Loans Bill was before the House. With regard to the loan of £5,000,000, he would like to know if the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony were liable for it, and was it a loan simply to be charged upon the assets to be acquired for railways and other public works? Was this country to have any say as to how these assets were to be administered and what return was to be got from them? It was said that those who paid the piper should call the tune, and he understood that they would call the tune with regard to the administration of the railways and rates to be charged. With regard to the £30,000,000 loan how was that to be worked? Under the terms of surrender, undertakings were given that no charge should be made upon landed property as compensation for the war. Was it to be charged upon the Transvaal as a whole, and was that consistent with the terms of surrender? If not, what was the money to be charged upon, and who was to undertake the charge? He took it that the Government of the Transvaal could not segregate its territory and declare that one part was liable for a certain charge and another part was not liable. The right hon. Gentleman must have some method of observing the terms of surrender. What means were to be taken for raising the interest on the £30,000,000? He thought if the right hon. Gentleman answered this catechism some light would be thrown on these matters.

*Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said there were a few points on which he desired information from the right hon. Gentleman, and he would state them very briefly indeed. The right hon. Gentleman had informed the House that he received over a hundred deputations during his visit to South Africa. He was sure they all sympathised with the right hon. Gentleman in the amount of labour that entailed on the limited time at his disposal. But there was one deputation which was not received, and the refusal to receive which had caused considerable dissatisfaction throughout the mining regions of the Transvaal. The white miners of the Transvaal had considerable grievances, certain changes having been made in the law which adversely affected them. The Transvaal Miners Association and the Trade Council, he was advised, requested the right hon. Gentleman to receive a deputation and hear their complaints. He was receiving deputations from the mine owners and other property owners, and naturally the workpeople thought they too would be received, but they were refused.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: It may simplify matters if I say that the hon. Gentleman has been misinformed. I received several deputations from the working classes, including the Trades Council and also the Transvaal Miners Association.

*Mr. KEIR HARDIE said he was much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman, but that was contrary to the information supplied to him. Another point on which he desired information had reference to the white miners in the Transvaal, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to give him an equally satisfactory assurance on the subject. Under the old laws of the Transvaal mining claims were allocated by allotment, and in this way every working miner had an equal chance of drawing a favourable lot, and becoming possessor of one of those claims. Recently, however, he was informed that the law had been altered, or it was proposed to be altered, so that these claims, instead of being disposed of as formerly, were to be sold to the highest bidder.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Gentleman has really been most unfortunate in his informant. What he has stated is not the case. There was a proposal—I am not certain whether it was passed into law by the late Government—to establish a lottery in regard to those claims, but no such lottery, I believe, was then held. The practice then was, that when the mining area was proclaimed it was open to everybody on a certain day, and people came in great numbers the night before, and as soon as the hour struck they formed up on the ground, and pegged out their respective claims. That law has not been altered, and the statement that the lots have been put up to auction is entirely inaccurate. Of course, the matter will be dealt with by the new gold law, but that is at present only a draft law and has not been submitted to the Legislative Council.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE said there was another point on which he desired to put a few questions to the right hon. Gentleman. He associated himself entirely with the suggestion of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Cambridge University that in securing natives from Central Africa great care should be taken to safeguard their rights and liberties as freemen. Among the many pledges given previous to the war, and during the earlier days of its continuance, none was more explicit or solemn than that the rights of the natives were to be rigidly preserved, and that anything approaching, even the appearance of, forced labour was to be neither encouraged nor permitted. But since those days there had already been the imposition of, a new tax in the Transvaal upon natives. The old tax of £2 per hut had been extended. Not only was that tax still paid, but £2 per wife was also claimed as an additional tax. It was self-evident, disguise the fact as they might, that this meant forced labour. The natives were able to live in comfort without going to the mines to work, but in order to induce them to go to the mines to work they were being called upon to pay a sum in money which could only be obtained by their proceeding to the mines to work. them and to earn wages. This was forced labour, and there was no use in pretending that it was not. All the sophistry that was used about making the native pay his share of the taxes was a mere blind to prevent the people of this country from seeing and realising the truth. If the mine owners of the Transvaal would treat natives fairly, and pay them the reasonable wages which were paid before the war, there need be no great difficulty in obtaining the necessary supply; and if native labour in South Africa was not adequate there was plenty of available labour in England, which could be obtained for the mines, if only right wages were paid. It was sometimes said white labour was not suitable for the mines, but at this moment the agents of the mining companies of the Transvaal were scouring Europe outside of England for white men. The objection to the British workman was not that he would not work in the mines but that the employers refused to pay the wage necessary to enable him to live a comfortable life in South Africa. [Hear, hear.] He would also like to know from the Secretary for the Colonies whether it was the case that the old Sunday laws, by which unnecessary Sunday labour was prohibited in the mines of the Transvaal, were being violated by the mining companies since work was resumed; and also whether the harbour works at Simonstown were being constructed by means of British labour, or whether cheap labour from the Continent—Poles, Italians, and others—was being used; and whether, if that was the case, it was not a violation of the terms of the contract.

MR. PEEL (Manchester, S.) said he would like to make one or two observations in reply to what had fallen from the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil. The hon. Member was under a complete misconception as to the idea that any British minister would countenance anything in the nature of forced labour in South Africa. He had spoken about the possibility of white labour being obtained for the working of the mines, and he said that agents had gone all over Europe to try to discover white labour to work in the mines. He himself believed, and it was known to all those who understood mining in South Africa, that it was impossible to get white labour to work in the mines of that country. It might be possible to obtain abroad a certain amount of white labour of a very undesirable kind, but he did not believe it was possible to get the right kind of white labour from this country to work in these mines.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE said this was not so. At a meeting of the Gold Trust in London a few weeks ago the Chairman gave three reasons why white labour from this country was not used in the mines; first, because it would cost too much; secondly, because white labour from this country would introduce the trail of the trade union serpent; and thirdly, because 100,000 Englishmen taken to the Transvaal would hold the government of the country in the hollow of their hands, and, with all respect to the working men, Lord Harris said the government should be where the brains were.

MR. PEEL said he was no familiar with the remarks which had been quoted by the hon. Gentleman, but he knew something about the mines, and he could tell the Committee that one of the great reasons why it was difficult to employ white labour was that in no part of the world could white and black labour be got to work together on equal terms. That was a thing well recognised in South Africa, in America, and in any country where there was black labour. He believed that there was a great field for skilled British labour, and the more they got native labour to fill up the mines the greater would be the demand for skilled labour in that country. The hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil said it was only necessary for the mine owners to pay more to the natives in South Africa in order to get any amount of labour. He had some figures on this subject which he thought disposed of the view the hon. Member took of this question. He believed it was not possible in South Africa, south of the Zambesi, to get sufficient native labour to work the mines. Of course South Africa could not be compared with many other portions of Africa. It could not be compared with West Africa, where there was a kind of civilisation, and where there was a large population. This was a country which had been invaded at different times, and the number of people scattered over the area was very sparse indeed. The figures which he had showed that six millions represented the whole of the native population south of the Zambesi. Now, supposing they took the proportion, which he believed was taken in France, of the active able-bodied people to the whole population at one in thirteen, that would give something like 400,000 for South Africa, south of the Zambesi, who were capable of active labour. What numbers were required for the mines? Before the war 97,000 were employed in the mines, and at the present moment there were only 50,000 so employed. He believed that at a low calculation 150,000 might easily be employed, and if the development which they all expected from recent indications, and from the visit of the Colonial Secretary, were to take place, no doubt 30,000 or 40,000 more could be employed. That would give 200,000 labourers—or half the number of able-bodied men in the country. It was, of course, impossible to expect that one-half of the active able-bodied population could devote themselves to labour in the mines. There were enormous quantities of these men employed on the farms and in domestic service; and there was this further fact—that they were told there was to be a great development of railway construction in South Africa; eight hundred more miles of railway were to be built in that country. That, of itself, would, at a modest computation, employ something like 30,000 more natives. When these reductions were made it was found that the able-bodied population in South Africa was scarcely sufficient, even if any amount of pay or the highest bribes were offered, to supply the mines as they were, and certainly not as they would be under some future system of development. Then it must be remembered that it was not every native or every class of native who were fit for work. Take the Basutos, who were a vigorous population always ready for and inclined to war, but who were not anxious to labour in the mines. He wanted to deal frankly with this matter and put aside all considerations of forced labour. That was absolutely out of the question, and nobody would agree to anything of the kind. He would also put aside the controversy in which Mr. Phillips had been engaged as to getting labourers for the mines South of the Zambesi. That labour was not to be bought with money, because it did not exist. He should like to know what was the actual policy of the Government on this matter, because it was a matter of extreme importance.

The prosperity of the Transvaal very largely depended upon the development of the mines. The price of living there, as everybody knew, was extremely high, and it was only if there was a rapid development of the mines that the cost of living would be lowered, and that they would be able to attract the white population which they all wanted in South Africa.

Various suggestions had been made, and among them that native labour should be brought from Central Africa and Uganda. He was more familiar with the conditions existing in Uganda than in Central Africa, and he disliked the idea of bringing labourers from Uganda for the reason that this country had recently spent large sums of money in developing the railway in Uganda. There was not a large excess in the number of labourers there, and they wanted to get back some of the money they had spent there. The only effect of importing labourers from Uganda, supposing they could be got, would be to raise the price of labour in that country, and make its development much more difficult. But there was another matter familiar to those who knew that country. It was generally supposed that the native savage was more capable of bearing hardships and the ill effects of climate than people like themselves, who enjoyed late hours and big dinners. He believed that was not the case. From the sea-board the land rose by terraces to the heights which bordered the Great Central Plateau of Africa; and he believed it was the fact that if the natives were transported from one plateau to another they suffered from diseases which they were able to combat on their own plateau, and with a slight rise of temperature they were unable to live. How much more would that apply if the Government or the mine owners were to bring down native labourers from Uganda to a totally different climate, and set them to work in the mines under totally different conditions to what they were accustomed to. Much as he was interested in mines in South-Africa he was himself afraid that a solution of that kind was wholly impossible, and therefore he dismissed the question of the importation of native labour from Uganda.

Then there was the question of coolie labour from India. There were great difficulties attending that also. Of course if our own subjects were brought from India we could not bind them down to work merely in the mines, and when they had worked a certain term to return at once to India. We must allow them, if they wished to remain in the country, to settle there. He believed that there was a very great objection to the importation of labour, from India on the part of the Indians themselves who had settled in Natal, and who would suffer from the competition of natives brought from India under any kind of indenture. What he wanted to point out was that the impossibility, or difficulty of getting the requisite amount of labour from South Africa, south of the Zambesi, or from other parts of Africa, and the further difficulty, or impossibility of obtaining white labour, because of the prejudice existing between white and black labour wherever they were employed together in any part of the world, had a very important bearing indeed on the question of the loan and the debt which was going to be placed on the Transvaal. That debt amounted to something like £65,000,000, and hon. Members could easily calculate for themselves the interest on that large amount. The income of that country was about £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 a year, and it was starting at once with a debt of something like fifteen times its income; if that was compared with the National Debt of Great Britain, calculated at fifteen times the Annual Budget, it would be seen what an enormous burden the Transvaal would have to bear. It would amount to a debt of £228 per head of the population. The inference he drew from that was not that they ought to diminish the amount, but that they must look with extreme care to all the sources of revenue that existed in that country. They must look to the mines on which the prosperity of the Transvaal depended, and the facilities for the payment of the war debt which so many people were anxious to put on South Africa. In conclusion, he wished to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on the success of his visit to South Africa, on the number of deputations he had received, on the number of speeches he had made, on the great mobility he had shown—a mobility which perhaps would put to shame many of our most distinguished generals; and he could only hope that some of that oil which the right hon. Gentleman had scattered so freely and impartially on both parties in South Africa would be reserved to be shed on the troubled political waters at home.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) said it seemed to him somewhat extraordinary that the British Central Africa Protectorate, which was already short of labour for the construction of their much needed railway—and which, on that account, was making very little progress—should be deemed capable of sending away natives to South Africa in order to work in the mines there. If that was to be the policy, great care should be taken that any natives recruited were entirely voluntary recruits. He knew that in this he had the sympathy of the Secretary for the Colonies because that right hon. Gentleman said in 1896 that "he had grave doubts as to the wisdom of direct inducements being offered to chiefs to supply native labour as it might lead to something like compulsory labour which could not be permitted." And in 1899 the right hon. Gentleman had repeated the same warning to the British South Africa Company. He hoped that nothing of that kind would be allowed by the Foreign Office. The Under-Secretary of the Foreign Office would know of a case which had been tried in the High Court of Central Africa, at Blantyre, with reference to the arbitrary conduct of the native police. He held in his hand a letter from Mr. Sharp, the Administrator of the Protectorate, in which that Gentleman acknowledged that the Assistant Director and the Chief Constable acted quite improperly in attempting to secure the services of natives who were already working for other Europeans. That showed how very important it was, when the actual officials were censured for improperly seeking to induce natives to work in the South African mines, to see that the recruiting should be very carefully supervised. He regretted that it should be done at all, for he believed, with the hon. Member who had just sat down, in the harm done by moving natives to a climate to which they were not accustomed, and that the British Central Africa Protectorate needed all their men for the construction of their railway.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs): I desire to ask one question. I wish to know if the Committee can have a statement of what has been spent for compensation in the new colonies, in order that we may know what the exact financial position is. I am not objecting to that expenditure; but I think we should have an exact statement of it, in order that we may know exactly where we stand. There is a kindred matter on which I wish to ask for information; and that is with reference to the financial position of the colonies themselves. Can we have an account of their revenue and outlay past and prospective, in order that we may know where we are.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I think it is perfectly natural that the hon. and learned Gentleman should wish to have a full statement showing exactly what has been expended for compensation. I imagine it will be impossible to give the figures accurately at the present time, because they have not been wholly ascertained, but if a general statement will satisfy the hon. and learned Gentleman's wish, I can tell him now roughly from memory what the amounts are. They are as follows: £3,000,000 as a free grant under the terms of peace; £2,000,000 additional for British subjects; £2,000,000 paid away for military receipts; and about £3,000.000 paid in Cape Colony and Natal. Then for compensation under proclamations, principally the proclamation by Lord Roberts, but also proclamations by other generals promising protection, an amount will be required which is at present estimated at £5.000,000. The total, therefore, which this country is paying, under circumstances in which such payments have never been made before, in order to restore the prosperity of the countries that we have annexed, amounts to something like £15,000,000.

SIR ROBERT REID: I am very much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman. That is very satisfactory as far as it is concerned, but I asked the right hon. Gentleman also about other outlays, for example the £1,000,000 voted this year for compensation for the constabulary.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: When we established the South African Constabulary we considered that for the purposes of police protection 6,000 men would be sufficient. While the war was in progress that force was used for military purposes, and Lord Roberts desired that it should be increased to 10,000 men. We, of course, agreed to that; but at the same time we made a condition that the additional expense should be treated as a military charge, and should not be charged to the colonies, but should be regarded as an Imperial charge. Accordingly, the £1,000,000 that has just been voted is in regard to so much of the expense as was due to the enlargement of the force over 6,000 men.

SIR ROBERT REID: I am much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman; but I also asked for information with regard to the outlay on other matters, not necessarily war expenditure, in these two colonies; for example, in supplementing the deficits in their budgets, and also for money spent in the purchase of land, the amount of which this House is not at present acquainted with. We ought to have before us an account showing the total outlay this country has incurred, irrespective of the £222,000,000 which we spent on the war; and also estimates of the revenue and expenditure of the two colonies, so that we may know our financial position in regard to them, what it is we have to spend, and the security on which we are asked to find this money.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I think I can quite understand. As regards the first point, I believe I can assure the House that no charge of any kind in addition to what I have stated will fall on this country. The £1,000,000 to which I referred was purely a military charge, but outside that there is, so far as I know at the present moment, no money to be voted or spent by this house on behalf of the people of this country for the benefit of the two colonies. Sums have been voted as grants-in-aid, but they will be repaid out of the loans; as, for instance, the amount for deficits in the earlier budgets of the Transvaal during the war. These will be repaid out of the first loan. Then the hon. and learned Gentleman asked me, very naturally, for a statement of the financial position of the two colonies. That will be submitted before the Bill is brought before the House. But it may be very satisfactory to the Committee to know that every succeeding return shows that the Estimates are being enormously exceeded; and I believe I am right in saying that the surplus in the two colonies next year will exceed the whole cost of the charge for the two loans.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE said he desired to make a personal explanation. Speaking from memory earlier in the evening, he stated that the right hon. Gentleman had refused to receive a deputation representing organised labour in South Africa. He had since had an opportunity of ascertaining the facts. The following extract appeared in the *Johannesburg Tribune*—

> "Our readers will remember the mass meeting that was held in the Market Square, on 29th November last, to deal with the situation created through the invalidation by a Supreme Court verdict of the Kruger Rent Proclamations. Motions were carried that the Secretary for the Colonies should be memorialised, and that a petition should be presented to him asking for relief, an influential Committee being formed to carry out the intention of the meeting. The Committee subsequently requested Mr. Chamberlain to receive a deputation in the matter delegated to them by the citizens. It will be learnt with indignation that Mr. Chamberlain has refused to meet the deputation. The landlords and mortgagees are amongst those to banquet Mr. Chamberlain on Saturday."

He now wished to ask whether that deputation was refused a hearing; and, if so, on what grounds?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: This is a totally different charge to the one made by the hon. Member in the first instance. He then said I refused to receive a deputation from working class representative organisations—the Miners' Association and the Trades Council. I told the hon. Member in reply that I had received a deputation from both these bodies; and that several complaints were brought to my notice by these deputations, and dealt with at the time. Now the hon. Member says that the deputation which I am reported to have refused to receive was a deputation from a mass meeting. I have had a large experience of mass meetings; and this particular meeting would undoubtedly not have been a successful demonstration in Hyde Park. It had nothing to do with the working classes; and it dealt with a particular class of property owners who complained of some regulation or ordinance made by the local government. I do not recollect any application to me to receive a deputation; I do not recollect having refused to receive one; but if I did, it was probably entirely on account of the fact that my time was so fully occupied that it was absolutely impossible for me to receive everyone who desired to see me.

MR. J. H. WHITLEY (Halifax) said he deeply regretted that the right hon. Gentleman had not been able to say anything to relieve the uneasy feeling that undoubtedly prevailed very widely in this country that something in the nature of compulsory labour was taking place in the new colonies. He would try and lay before the right hon. Gentleman the grounds on which this uneasy feeling, which undoubtedly existed, was based. He had hoped that in the very first word which the right hon. Gentleman would address to the House after his tour, he would have been able to give an assurance that unde the British flag no compulsory labour, direct or indirect, would ever be permitted; and he hoped that the time would not be far distant when the right hon. Gentleman would give that assurance. In reply to a Question yesterday the right hon. Gentleman appeared to be plainly contemplating an increase in the taxation of the natives. The uneasy feeling to which he referred, and which he thought had a great deal to do with the great revulsion of feeling in connection with the war, was due to people asking this question—"What did we fight that war for? Certainly not to get cheap labour for the mine-owners." He could tell the right hon. Gentleman that that question was being asked all over the country. It was based, perhaps, not on facts which could as yet be regarded as certainties, but they wished the suspicion to be removed from their minds by the right hon. Gentleman.

He would give three instances of what it was that had given rise to this uneasy feeling. In the first place, the moment the war was over the mine-owners reduced the wages of the natives from 60s. per month to 35s. That was the very first change made in the policy of the mine-owners, when the sufferings of the British troops and the money that had been expended had won a hard-earned victory. That fact arrested attention. The second piece of evidence was the undoubted pressure which had come from the mine-owners for many months past in order, as they had put it, to compel the native to recognise the dignity of labour. That was a doctrine in which he firmly believed, but he thought if the Government were going to uphold the doctrine they would do well to commence at home rather than in the colonies. With the permission of the Committee he would quote what the *Transvaal Leader* had to say upon this subject. This was how they regarded the native question—

> "There is one way and one way only to subdue the negro, and it is with the lash. Never treat a native with more than ordinary human kindness. There is in fact no difference between the ordinary native and the baboon beyond the fact that the former can talk and the latter will not."

Was not such an attitude alone sufficient to justify the very uneasy feeling which existed in this country that something was going on which was not to be expected would go on under the British flag? That was the attitude of one section of the people of South Africa on this subject. On one occasion it was said in this House that we were all Members for India; were we not also all Members for these colonies, and for the black races who were now our fellow-subjects? He hoped we should never come to regard the native races in such a manner as was indicated in the passage he had just quoted. The third reason for this justifiable feeling of uneasiness was the new tax which had already been placed upon the native at the instance of the mine-owners. The right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary had stated on the previous day that the taxation of the native was now lower than under the Boer *régime*, but he (Mr. Whitley) had evidence, which the right hon. Gentleman would not contradict, to the contrary. The Boer law of 1895 provided that there should be a poll tax of £2 a head on every native; Lord Milner's ordinance not only provided for the re-imposition of that poll tax, but for a further tax of £2, instead of 10s. for each additional wife. The right hon. Gentleman had said he did not approve of polygamy—

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Do you?

MR. WHITLEY said he certainly did not approve of abolishing it by means of taxation, and he did not approve of the violent interference with the customs of natives so recently subjected to our rule. That tax had been put on at the instigation of the mine-owners, apparently with the view of teaching the Kaffir, as the phrase went, to recognise the dignity of labour. That meant that it was not sufficient for the native in the location which he had been placed, when the white men had taken his country, to till the land and tend his cattle and grow sufficient food for his wife and children; he must work at a wage for the white man. He wished the Committee to bring some pressure to bear on the right hon. Gentleman to consider the labour question of South Africa from the opposite point of view. The great idea of the war was that we should make South Africa a country where the British workman could live. The white labour question was the important problem to us. The idea was not that there should be a ring of millionaires and wealthy people at the top, but that there should be a broad basis of a great white citizenship. The experiment of white labour had been tried in one mine, and the result of that experiment had been to show that the work had been carried out with white labour with such expedition that it was a record in the country, and the increased cost, as compared with black labour, had only been about 20 per cent. Upon that he had made a calculation. He had found that the dividends paid by the mines which had re-opened since the war were some 25 or 30 per cent., and as the result of his calculation he had arrived at the conclusion that the introduction of white labour in place of black would only mean a reduction of 10 per cent. in those divisions. All the black labour did was to allow of the working of the low-grade mines, and if that was the only excuse for the introduction of black labour, in his opinion it was better that these low-grade mines should not be worked.

Another question to which he wished to draw the attention of the right hon. Gentleman, who he regretted had been obliged to leave the House, was the question of the loan of £30,000,000. He had no objection to the loan of £35,000,000, but he had the greatest objection to the loan of £30,000,000, which was to be a contribution towards the cost of the war. He could not see why the mine-owners who met the right hon. Gentleman at Johannesburg should have power to pledge the total assets of these colonies as security for the loan. His objection to the transaction lay in the fact that the right hon. Gentleman had allowed a group of mine-owners to underwrite this loan, and to that extent had put them in the position of mortgagees of the assets of the Transvaal, and put them in a position to direct the future of these colonies, which, in his opinion, was most undesirable.

The last matter to which he wished to refer was the "Conference Ring," with regard to freights in South Africa. The high rate of living in South Africa was largely due to this "ring," which controlled all the shipping of South Africa. He wished to draw the attention of the Colonial Secretary to the very serious position in which we stood with regard to British trade in this matter. He thought it was very hard that the British trader should find that, by reason of this "ring," in freights the best business should be given to Germany on the one side and the United States on the other. It had been pointed out by Mr. F. Thompson, a member of the Cape Assembly, that to business men the whole important question was the shipping one. The "Conference" lines of New York could send goods for a freight charge of 12s. a ton, while British merchants had to pay from 35s. to 40s. a ton, and that it was no use to attempt to bring goods to the Exhibition in Cape Town unless they combined to attack the shipping rates.

He had risen at the earliest opportunity, because matters of very intense interest to a vast number of traders in this country were involved, and they were matters which were very serious indeed, as affecting the prosperity of British trade in South Africa. In one instance an order for steel rails was quoted on equal terms and at the same price by a British and an American maker, but the order went to America because the freight from that country was about half. From German ports he had known freights at much lower rates even in the same ship. He trusted the Colonial Office would give careful attention to this matter. The money connected with these new loans would be very largely expended upon materials shipped from this country, and the Colonial Office ought to use their influence to secure freedom of British trade, and enable British traders to have at least equal terms with their competitors in other parts of the globe. He trusted the matter would receive careful attention from the Colonial Secretary.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said he quite conceived that it would be impossible to discuss these matters properly until the Papers connected with them were laid on the Table of the House. Therefore he did not propose to enter into many of the questions. With regard to the £15,000,000 which had been paid after the war, and the amount paid for compensation to meet those claims, nobody would grudge the money. What they complained of was the occasion that had made this liability necessary, but any generosity displayed in that respect he was sure would meet with the general approval of everybody on both sides of the House. With regard to native labour he understood the Colonial Secretary to say that he had arrived at no decision upon this question. That might be due to the imperfect reporting of his speeches, but certainly an impression had been caused by speeches delivered in Johannesburg that the right hon. Gentleman had arrived at a decision, and that he had made a declaration in favour of forcing the natives by taxation to work in the mines. If the right hon. Gentleman was in favour of that policy it was desirable that it should be known. He understood that this was regarded more as a tax for the repression of polygamy, but it was really a tax encouraging polygamy. What happened at the mines? The natives went to the mines, earned a lot of money, and then they went home and bought wives. What was the process? The Colonial Secretary proposed to repress polygamy. He first imposed a tax to drive the natives to the mines, and then they earned a lot of money and bought wives with it. So far from being a tax for suppressing polygamy, it promoted it. It was not the polygamist that would be driven to the mines, for he would remain at home with his twenty or thirty wives, who would probably work for him, and possibly pay the tax as well. It was only the bachelor that they would drive into the mines, and this was simply using an argument for putting upon a false basis the whole problem of the taxing of labour in South Africa.

The real object of all this was to get cheap labour in South Africa under market prices. The hon. Member for Manchester represented the views of those who were in close contact with capital in South Africa, and he said that there were only 400,000 natives available for this class of work in South Africa. His own reckoning was that the total was 500,000, but he would take it at 400,000. Before the war there were 150,000 natives employed in the mines. Really that was not an unfair proportion of the population available for working in the mines, and it amounted to about 30 per cent. That was as large as the proportion in this country. Why should they have special legislation for the purpose, not of enforcing labour but of compelling British subjects to work in a special class of labour in which they did not want to work? This was not the kind of work which attracted a native in sunny climates. Here they were forcing him to work underground at the most unattractive form of labour, even for a Kaffir. The result was that the Basuto, who was the finest type of native in South Africa, would not work in the mines. Why should they compel them to do this? The proportion of those working in the mines was given as 150,000 out of 400,000, but what about the natives working in Cape Town, Durban, in the docks, and employed in all classes of labour around the towns, and on all the farms as shepherds? Surely that was quite as important to the development of the country as working in mines.

Those who defended this system would probably say they were not forcing them to work anywhere. He wished to point out, however, that a tax meant that they were forcing them to work in the mines, because they were not paid in cash for working on farms, but were paid in kind, or perhaps got a plot of land. Why should they force them to work in labour which was not healthy? Anyone who looked at the statistics of the deaths due to natural causes in mines knew how horrible the class of labour was for the Kaffirs. There was no class of labour in this country that caused so many deaths as this labour, which was forced upon the Kaffir in the Transvaal. These natives were not old men, but men in the prime of their strength, and still the number of deaths amongst them was appalling, because it was a kind of labour that did not suit the Kaffir constitution. It was not as if they worked for ten or fifteen years, but it meant that in the course of a year or two this labour was so unsuitable to the Kaffir that he broke completely down. It was an act of unheard-of oppression that they should force the natives to work in these mines. Why should they do it? In the mines in America white labour was employed. If they took Australia, it was also white labour, and he should like to see the House of Commons try to force black labour upon the mines in Australia. He knew what would happen if they did.

Since the days of the Spanish Empire in South America nothing of this kind had been known, and that undermined the strength of the Spanish Empire at home. The reason for this was that they were obtaining wealth by oppressive means, and they would deserve to be punished for it in the end. Before the war there were about 110,000 people working in the mines around Johannesburg, and they were paid at the rate of £3 10s. per month. That was not an unfair proportion considering the number of people available. After the war the total was 57,000, and why? Because the rate of wages had been put down to 1s. per day. A very remarkable letter had just appeared in the Press from the rector of Thaban-Chu, in which it was stated that the natives were being forced to work on Government works, and the natives were complaining. They stated that they were perfectly loyal during the war, and they were most helpful to our troops, and he believed himself that but for the assistance of the natives he did not think they would have brought the war to a conclusion at all. The natives complained that now the war was over this country was using her power to force them to work like slaves upon Government works and in the mines around Johannesburg. The rector of Thaban-Chu stated that if they would treat the natives kindly they would readily respond, and there was no difficulty in keeping them to their agreements. Why should the natives not be treated fairly, and allowed to go with their labour to the best market, like anybody else? The mere fact that they were black men ought to compel us to treat them with generosity. What would be the value of sending missionaries to South Africa in the face of the practical working of this Christian Empire? If it was desired to give these people an exalted idea of Christian morality, let justice, first of all, be done to them. The mines ought to be closed unless they could keep open without a system of slavery. In Wales there were no end of mines—coal, slate, copper, and gold mines—closed because of the heavy cost of labour. If Chinese or Indian labour was to be imported, or if the natives were to be forced to work for a shilling a day in order that the South African mines might be kept open, why should it not be done for the gold mines in Wales? There was no reason why the mines should be kept open unless they paid the fair market wage. It was too expensive for the Empire to keep them open, because it was being done at the cost not only of the £250,000,000 spent on the war, but also of perpetrating an act of injustice such as no Empire could survive. The reason had been given that it was to keep the British connection. British connection! Who were the Britishers for whom the name of the Empire was being soiled with this infamy? Who were the British patriots that had underwritten the debt of £10,000,000? Among the names were Werner Beit, Barnato, Hyams, and

Goerz, while the remainder was bought up by a gentleman named Moses. In the whole list there was only one Britisher, who, it needed scarcely to be said, was a Scotchman. No other race could survive such environment. He rather thought that in the meeting between the two cities of Birmingham and Jerusalem the latter had got the better of the bargain.

A real sense of uneasiness existed on this question of native labour, and the Committee were entitled to ask for information as to what was happening. The notion that the Boers were oppressing the natives had more than anything else to do with the popularity of the war and the determination of the British people to put an end to the Transvaal Government. Would there have been that determination had it been known that we were going to set up a worse system of forced labour? The war was entered upon, £250,000,000 had been spent, and thousands of precious lives forfeited, largely for the purpose of emancipating the natives, and the country ought to insist on the undertaking given and sealed by the blood of our soldiers being carried out.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I think the discussion has gone far enough to justify me in getting up in answer to the appeals which have been addressed to me by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife and others. The right hon. Gentleman said he would like to hear something as to the progress which is being made towards the establishment of those representative institutions which we have always regarded as the ultimate goal of our operations in South Africa. I need not say that the opinion and the policy of the Government have not changed in the slightest degree in respect to this matter. We are anxious, as I took occasion to say in public several times in the course of my visit, to be relieved as soon as possible of the responsibility which Crown colony government entails, and to give the new colonies the same institutions as are enjoyed by other self-governing colonies. Up to the present time we have taken only one step in that direction, which indeed is the usual first step in the progress of a colony from the strictest form of Crown colony government to free institutions.

We have, in the first place, now established elective municipalities. I do not think the election has actually taken place, but we have proposed elective municipalities for Johannesburg, Pretoria, and other places, which will give fully representative municipal government. In addition, we have established a semi-representative Legislative Council in the Orange River Colony; that is to say, we have established a Legislative Council in which, in addition to the official members, a minority of members have been nominated by the Government, having been selected by the Government as representing in the best possible way the different interests in the colony. As far as I know, I believe the work of the Council has given satisfaction.

We propose to follow that up by calling together in the present month or, at the latest, in April, a Legislative Council for the Transvaal. There also, in the first instance, we shall retain a majority of nominated members, but the representative element will represent every class and section. There will be representatives, of course, of the great industry of the Transvaal, of the shop-keeping element, of the farming element, of the old Boer element, of the new Boer element — that is, of the Boers who early surrendered, or who supported the Government in their endeavours—and of the working classes; in fact, we shall endeavour, as far as is humanly possible, to secure what will really be a representative minority. It is the intention of the Transvaal Government to bring various important questions before this body, and not to use the Government majority except in cases in which Imperial or other similar interests are concerned. That is the first step. According to the original view of the Government, and my present view, that should be followed, I hope at no distant date, by substituting elected for nominated representatives, but still maintaining the Government majority.

Then the third and last step will be the concession of full self-government. That is the process through which the Cape

Colony, Natal, and all the self-governing colonies have proceeded to their present position, and, in my judgment, there is much to be said for observing it in the case of the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. In regard to that there is one point I should like very much to impress upon the House, and that is the decision of the Boer Generals not to take part in the Legislative Council. I have had the most intimate intercourse with General Delarey, close to his own residence, where he received me most hospitably, and where, I hope, we established a friendship which may probably last; and on that occasion I asked the general to serve as a representative on the Council. After some little protest on his part, he agreed to do so. He did not, at that time, raise the objections which were subsequently raised, but he expressed the opinion that he could better assist the Government in his own way among his own people rather than by absenting himself from them for considerable periods in order to attend to legislative work at Pretoria. I suppose that after he reached Pretoria he consulted with the other two generals—General Botha and General Smuts—and that they persuaded him to withdraw his assent. I only mention his previous agreement to show the spirit in which he, at all events, is prepared to meet the situation. He assured me then—and I have not the slightest doubt whatever as to the sincerity of his assurance—that he was perfectly ready to co-operate with the Government in every possible way. The generals addressed to Lord Milner a letter which, no doubt, is within the knowledge of the House. I have seen attempts to go behind the letter, and to impute to the generals other reasons for their refusal. That seems to me to be most insulting to the generals themselves. At all events, I have no reason to believe that they had any *arrière pensée* in the form of the document they presented. What they said was—and I think they are wiser than some of those Liberals who are so anxious at any moment to impose self-government on colonial possessions—that in their opinion the country was not ready for self-government. What they needed above all was rest from agitation, and at present they preferred to trust to the action and to the responsibility of the Government rather than to throw into discussion all the difficult and complex questions which might arise.

I often think that people talk about self-government without remembering exactly what it means. People talk about self-government as if it meant the government of the individual who is talking by himself, but it is nothing of the kind. Self-government is the government of the majority, and a majority even of one is able, under a system of self-government, to impose its will, however tyrannical and unreasonable it may be, upon the minority, and nobody may say them nay. Crown colony government is not, as generally supposed, the arbitrary government of an outside authority. It is rather a government which, while it directs its proceedings in accordance with the general wishes, so far as they can be ascertained, of the majority, also considers it one of its first duties to protect the minority against a majority which may be unreasonable, and it is on that ground that Crown colony government can be, and is, defended in all the cases in which it now exists, and it is upon that ground that the Boer generals represent, as far as they were concerned, that they would prefer to see the continuance of Crown colony government for the present rather than an immediate resort to self-government.

Great importance seems to be attached to their view, that in the interests of the two colonies it is desirable that a certain time, not a long time in the history of a nation, but still a certain time, should elapse before full self-government is accorded. Whether a long time will elapse I really cannot say. One thing is clear—if the population of the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony, both Boer and Briton, by a large majority desire this self-government, even although it might seem to us to be premature, I should think it unwise to refuse it. I do not myself believe there is any such danger connected with Imperial interests that we should hesitate to accord it on that ground. The ground on which I should desire that it might be delayed is really the interest of the two colonies themselves, and not any Imperial interest. I believe that the temporary influence of the Crown colony system is desirable, at all events for some years to come, in the interests of the two colonies.

I think that gives to the House information as to what has been done, and also information, for what it is worth, as to what I think ought to be done. But there is one point to which I wish to call the attention of the House in connection with the other matter to which attention has been directed. When you have given this self-government to the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony, what use will it be for you to protest against their native policy, whatever it may be? I confess that I regret the discussion which has taken place, because I believe it is mischievous, because I am certain it is ill-informed, and because I think it is calculated to produce the very evils which those who have introduced it deprecated. What does this discussion imply? It implies that our fellow-subjects in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colonies, and the members of a self-governing colony, are unworthy of their name of Britons, are anxious for violent methods, are ready to introduce forced labour—slavery—and to do this with the meanest motives and the most sordid personal objects. I say that this charge—and I say it now when I am fresh from my recent experience—is resented, and deeply resented, by our kinsmen across the water, and that it does infinite harm by the sense it produces of injustice and unreasonableness, and the display of cheap philanthropy at their expense. All this goes far to separate our own people from us and to provoke in them an antagonistic feeling which, as I say, may lead to the very results which you desire to avoid.

Now for all the charges which have been made in fairly moderate language by other Members, and in his usual violent style by the hon. Member for Carnarvon, there is not the slightest foundation. There is at the present time no demand by any person of any responsibility or authority for forced labour in any shape or form. As for slavery, the idea does not enter into the mind of any British subject out there. The condition of the native at the present time in the Transvaal is better than it was before the war. All the promises we have made have been fulfilled in that respect. But there is one thing I am bound to say in justice to our late foes. I was led, as probably the majority in this House were led, by statements which were made, to think and to believe that the treatment of the native by the Boer was very bad, and in that belief we expressed the hope that when we came we should be able to improve it. Now the war itself is evidence that this charge against the Boers was exaggerated. I freely make that admission. If it had not been exaggerated, it is impossible to believe that the Boers could, as I know they did in hundreds and thousands of cases, leave their wives and children and property and stock to their charge, and in the care of a few natives they had had previously on their farms. Very few outrages took place, and undoubtedly in many cases the natives gave assistance to the Boers during the war just as in many other cases they gave assistance to us. And, therefore, although the conception of the native by the Boer is something totally different to the conception which has been put before the House in the course of the present debate, and represents, no doubt, the British idea of the relations between the races, yet of real brutality, violent misconduct, or ill-treatment, I think that in the majority of cases at any rate they must be absolved. The relation between the two races is quite different from that put forward. They repudiate entirely any idea of equality. They regard the native as little better than an animal, and certainly in no case as deserving of different treatment from what would be given to a child. They do not hesitate to apply corporal punishment for very slight offences, and in other respects they act in a way which would undoubtedly be reprobated in a British subject. But they seem somehow or other to have understood the native character. They have not been regarded on the whole as hard or severe masters by the natives, and and no ill-feeling has ever sprung up between them.

In spite of that, the position of the natives is better under the present Government than it was under the last. In many ways they have been relieved, and especially they have been relieved in the matter of taxation.

I do not know where hon. Members get their information from, but, at all events, it differs altogether from that which is in my possession. The taxation under the late Government was as follows—hut tax 10s., poll tax £2, road tax 2s. 6d., dog tax 10s., making £3 2s. 6d. In addition passes were charged 2s. per month, which amounted to another 24s. a year, the total taxation payable by the native thus being £4 6s. 6d. I do not mean to say there were not some exceptions, but that represents the general condition of taxation. We have substituted for that one consolidated tax amounting to £2, in lieu of all the taxes hitherto imposed upon the natives. But if the native has more than one wife he has to pay a further tax of £2 for each additional wife. Some hon. Gentleman said that this legislation is at the dictation of the mine-owners. That is absolutely without a scrap of foundation. As far as I know the mine-owners had nothing whatever to say to it from beginning to end. [AN HON. MEMBER: "They asked for it."] They did not ask for it; I deny it. They did not ask for that particular tax. I suppose what the hon. Gentleman has in his mind is that they are asking for more taxes now. That is a different thing. This legislation is independent of any influence on the part of the mine-owners. This particular taxation is against polygamy, over which practice the hon. Member for Halifax appears to be inclined to throw his shield. This taxation is suggested by a leading missionary, and to my mind there is an immense deal to say for it. I do not say the practice of polygamy is one which the Government should encourage. On the contrary, I think it is one we should, as far as possible, endeavour to discourage. But the practice of polygamy is very closely connected with the labour question, as I have pointed out when I was in South Africa, because the wife does the outdoor labour for the husband. The husbandry of the native on the land is carried out by means of the wives he possesses. Therefore, in addition to the comfort and companionship and womanly solace which numerous wives may give the men, there is also the important consideration of the addition to the reduction in his labour bill. As regards the question of taxation, I really cannot understand the line of argument of some gentlemen who have said that if you put a tax upon the native it is a mere sham for you to say that that is not forced labour.

Sir, we are all taxed. Are we the subjects of the condolences and commiseration of hon. Gentlemen? We are all of us taxed, and taxed heavily. Is that a system of forced labour, against which hon. Members think it necessary to protest? No; the sham is in the argument which these gentlemen adduce. Of course, if you can show that the taxation is unfair on its merits, or excessive in its amount, let that by all means be made the subject for consideration, but to say that because we put a tax on a native, therefore he is reduced to a condition of servitude and of forced labour is, to my mind, absolutely ridiculous. I have said, in answer to a question, that, in my opinion, he is nowhere overtaxed, and in some places immensely undertaxed, having regard to the advantages brought to him by the British Government. What are those advantages? What is the position of these native races now, and what was their position before we undertook the responsibility for them? No Zulu under Cetewayo, or under Umtali, or, indeed, under any great Zulu chief, could call his life his own. No Zulu could hold property except by the permission and goodwill of his chief. Every man was liable to be wiped out, and whole tribes of them were decimated under the tyranny which prevailed. From what do we protect them? From the consequences of internecine warfare, from slavery in its direct and worst form, from the slave-trade. From all these evils we are protecting the native; and it is perfectly fair, to my mind, that he should contribute something towards the cost of administering the country. It is ridiculous to say that any charge which has hitherto been made on the native represents more than a very slight contribution in the way of personal labour. Many do not require to give personal labour at all. When they enjoy a large family of wives they do not require to give personal labour. The whole of the tax can be earned by a few weeks' of moderate labour. In these circumstances I do not think they are deserving of the pity and consideration which have been extended to them.

Now, Sir, hitherto I have spoken generally as to the principles which must regulate the question of native labour everywhere and in every colony. Here it is complicated by the connection of the subject with the great industry of the country; and, unfortunately, some hon. Gentlemen opposite have somehow or other contracted such a prejudice against this particular industry and the persons engaged in it that they seem disinclined to hear anything whatever in its favour whenever it comes in question. I have pointed out before to the House of Commons that, if that prejudice is caused by envy and jealousy of the large fortunes which have been made, it should be borne in mind that these fortunes have not been made, as a rule, by the direct working of the gold mines, but by speculation, which is open to, and I believe sometimes engaged in, by persons who are not mining magnates. Gold-mining is just as much a legitimate industry as the coal industry in this country. It is wholly a question of the cost of getting material, and the price it will fetch in the market. [HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!] Yes, but I have to put these rather simple truths before the House, because I have to make my way clear. Incidentally I am answering some of the statements made in the course of the discussion It is a very simple question: What rate of wages can be paid in order that this industry should be self-supporting and prosperous? Before I discuss that, however, let me remind the House what hangs upon this industry. It is the great industry of the Transvaal. The prosperity of the Transvaal, at all events for many years to come, will entirely depend upon it. It does not affect the British population alone; it affects still more largely, perhaps, the Boer population and the agricultural population. The prosperity of the agricultural population will depend upon the extent to which they can find markets for their produce in the towns. Our whole policy in South Africa, its success or its failure, is enormously bound up with the success or failure of the legitimate gold-mining industry. It is, therefore, our object and interest that the mines, not only the wealthy mines where gold is found in comparatively large quantities and where a profit can be easily made—not only that those mines should be profitably worked, but that the low-grade ores should also be profitably worked; and it is the contention of the mine-owners that they cannot be profitably worked if any addition, however slight, is put on the cost of working; that the margin is so small that it will only allow them to employ the smallest amount of white labour; in fact, that no addition to the cost of working can safely be made. On whose authority is that statement made? After all, it seems to be the opinion of some people that these statements are rashly made for their own personal interest by those who are described as mining magnates. That is not the case at all. These statements are made by the mining engineers, who are not, as a rule, millionaires, but men of great capacity and great experience. The majority of them are Americans, who have been accustomed in their own country to working, with white labour, various grades of ore; and it is on the authority of these men that those statements are made. Their statement is that, although you may slightly increase the proportion of white labour, you cannot depend upon white labour. Wherever the work is purely muscular—and a great deal of the labour is purely muscular—the native is as good as the white man, and the white man cannot possibly do the same work at anything like the same rate of pay as the Kaffir can. I accept these statements from people who are much more competent than I am myself. I have had to inform myself on the subject and to hear the different views expressed. One engineer, and one only—he is in a minority of one—is more sanguine than his colleagues as to the possibility of greatly increasing the proportion of white labour; but at present the experiment he has tried, with the full authority of the mine-owners, is still in the trial stage, and it is too early to say whether it will be a success. In the meantime it is perfectly evident that if the mines are to be worked as they have been hitherto, it is necessary that something like 100,000 additional native or other cheap labourers must be found. Let me allude in passing to the observation of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Merthyr Tydvil. He said that white labour might be introduced instead of Kaffir labour, and then he said that those who were interested in the mines were scouring Europe for cheap white labour. One of the deputations, which the hon. Member thought I had not received, came to me with a complaint on that same point; and undoubtedly those men who are paid high wages in South Africa are opposed to the introduction even of white labour. Therefore the mine-owners are reduced to this, that their choice is confined to Kaffir labour at 50s. or 60s. a month, or skilled white labour now worth £30 a month; and the House will see that, as long as that enormous margin remains it is clearly impossible that the mines which can be worked profitably with cheap labour can equally well be worked profitably with the higher-priced labour. First of all, before the war the mines had 100,000 Kaffirs working in them. At the present time they have only about 50,000, although since I left I believe that number has considerably increased. This falling off was due to many causes. In the first place, it is, I think, justly attributed to the fact that the mine-owners attempted a reduction of the wages. I do not know that the Committee are aware that they all recognise that that was a mistake, and they have now gone back to the original rate of wages. It was undoubtedly a hasty action on their part, and was not calculated to secure the large amount of additional labour they required. But the mistake has been corrected, and now the wages are practically the same as they were before the war. That no doubt in some way accounts for the reduction of the number.

But in addition to that, there has arisen since the war a very large demand for Kaffir labour for other purposes—for railways, for building operations, and even for agricultural operations; and it is the belief of those who are well informed on the subject that probably at the present moment there are as many Kaffirs actually labouring in South Africa as there were before the war, although a much smaller proportion of them are employed in the mines. I believe that larger numbers can be obtained even now from the old source of supply; and I would venture to urge on the mine-owners that more might be done to make the work more attractive, and especially to make the time of recreation more enjoyable. I visited the mines at Kimberley, and there I found a state of things existing very much in advance of anything on the Rand. There the mine-owners constantly employ 12,000 labourers, and they have no difficulty whatever in obtaining a sufficient supply of labourers. The natives come from very great distances, and come voluntarily to take up the work. That is entirely due to the care and attention given to them while in the compounds, and to the efforts made to make their life happier and more agreeable. I think, therefore, that if more attention is given on the Rand, if more efforts are made to make labour attractive, we may expect to get a larger proportion of labourers from the existing source of supply.

Then, turning to other districts north of the Zambesi, I quite agree with my right hon. friend the Member for the University of Cambridge that we have to be careful in any matter of this kind; and there can be no possible objection to laying on the Table of the House the regulations which have been framed. As I have said, it is proposed now to put 1,000 natives of Central Africa in the mines, and if they appreciate the life there, no doubt a much larger number will hereafter go there. The railway of which an hon. Gentleman opposite spoke has not been commenced, and will not be commenced for some time; but it does not at present affect the question at all. And let me point out that it is a very unfair thing to say to the labourers in a particular colony or protectorate, "You shall not go, whether you like it or not, where your labour will be best remunerated." The feeling of anxiety to prevent labourers going from the Central African or East African Protectorates is the feeling of the people on the spot, who are now getting the labour of these men for a quarter or a fifth of what the mines are willing to pay, because when they return they will demand larger wages from their former employers than are now paid in these protectorates. I think it would be wrong to lay down any general policy and to declare that the native labourer is practically to be *adscriptus glebæ*; that he must not move from his own protectorate even if higher wages are offered to him elsewhere.

I believe that from these various sources very considerable additions will be made to the ranks of labour, and that without anything in the nature of either forced labour or compulsion in any shape or form. Whether it will be sufficient, I must leave it to the future to decide; but I say it is premature to discuss that question now. I saw that there was considerable feeling expressed at the proposal said to have been made to me for the introduction of Asiatic or Chinese labour. Let me say, in the first place, that no such proposal was made or, as far as I know, is likely to be made. Every one concerned in the matter, even those who take the most pessimistic view of the future, is agreed that every other possible source of supply must be exhausted before the introduction of Asiatic or Chinese labour is even thought of. At the present moment, as every one knows, colonial feeling throughout South Africa is, by a very large majority against any such proposal. Why, then, should the House of Commons intervene to beat itself against an open door, and to teach our colonists what they ought to do, to interfere with the rights which we have conceded to the self-governing communities? It is against that that I protest, as being bad policy on the part of the House of Commons. As I have pointed out, if it had ever come to pass that a self-governing colony like the Cape or Natal should desire the importation of persons from any part of the world outside the British territories, there is no power or authority or right on our part to prevent it. And if that is so, is it dignified to be making protests, especially when those protests are entirely premature? I have said as much as I need to say at the present moment; and I hope I have convinced the House that if there has been in the minds of any hon. Members any such anxiety as has been alleged with regard to the new regulations, or interference with the liberty of the natives, which would constitute forced labour, I hope I have been able entirely to remove that anxiety. I say again there is no shadow of a shade of foundation for it.

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said that the right hon. Gentleman had not convinced him, and he did not think he had convinced many hon. Members on that side of the House, that there was no intention to force the natives to labour in the mines in South Africa, by imposing on them a heavy tax. The right hon. Gentleman very fairly stated the arguments used by the mine owners in South Africa. The truth was there were certain high-grade mines which paid very well; but there were other mines of low-grade which could only pay by very cheap labour; and the only way in which those mines could be worked was to impose a heavy tax on the natives, who would then have to leave their homes and earn money; and the only place that would be open to them would be the mines. The right hon. Gentleman did not tell the Committee that the reason why the wages had been reduced was to prevent the natives working for a time, and accumulating a sum of money. Fancy such a doctrine being enunciated in any part of England! What was it but forced labour? It was the plainest thing in the world; and he thought the country was beginning to perceive it. The natives were to be taxed with the deliberate intention of obliging them to work in order to pay the tax; that was to all intents and purposes forced labour. The right hon. Gentleman alluded again to what he might call "the wife argument." He seemed to be particularly enamoured of it. It was first used in defence of the tax upon Kaffirs in South Africa. The right hon. Gentleman said that by making the Kaffirs work in the mines, they would be practically doing away with slavery; because otherwise they bought wives and forced them to work for them. That was quite a mistake. Had the right hon. Gentleman been in any of the kraals in which the natives lived? It was quite a mistake to suppose that the Kaffirs forced their wives to work. He himself was not in favour of polygamy; and he did not suppose any hon. Member was; but he was rather surprised that the missionaries should complain of it, seeing that many of the patriarchs had a great many wives. What happened was this. The native law with regard to marriage was infinitely better and safer for women than the law in this country. When a Kaffir wanted to marry a wife, he handed over a certain number of cattle to one of her friends. Those cattle were regarded as belonging to the wife; and if the woman was maltreated she might go to her representative, and if it were proved under native law that the Kaffir had illtreated her, then he was fined one or more head of cattle; and if the illtreatment continued the wife might withdraw to her family and take possession of all the cattle. He believed it would be much better for many unfortunate women if there was such a law in this country. He only referred to the matter to show that it was a perfect mistake to suppose that the women were in any sort of way slaves; a Kaffir himself did not care about the dignity of labour; he looked after the cattle, and the women did the hoeing in the little plot round the house.

It was stated on the best authority that as a rule Kaffir women were not ill-treated by their husbands; they were proud of working in the little plots; and in fact acted as good, respectable wives. The right hon. Gentleman and his friends in South Africa seemed to have adopted the system, of which they had read in the Scriptures, of a man working seven years for a wife. They were using the wives of the Kaffirs to attract labour to the mines. He did not understand why the Kaffirs should not be left alone in their villages. Was the theory of the dignity of labour to be applied in this country? Were landowners to be compelled to work on their own land? Were those who toiled not, neither did they spin, to be told that they must practise the dignity of labour? Let them apply those laws in England if they were to be applied in the Transvaal. What was their object? It was to get cheap labour for the mines, and to prevent English labourers from going out to South Africa and selling their labour. In every part of the world employers of labour would be glad to have cheap labour. In this country the coal owners might make a very good case for importing Chinese and African labour. They could point to the competition of foreign countries, and say that if they had Chinese or African labour they would be able to export coal in very much larger quantities. But what reception would such a proposal receive in this country. What would the working men of this country say if such a proposal were made? That it was a bad system to allow money to accumulate in the hands of a poor man because he might get proud and haughty? No doubt there were a great many seams of coal in England which could be perfectly well worked if native labour could be imported.

The right hon. Gentleman spoke of a number of American engineers whom he met, and whom he described as independent men. They were very independent indeed! They were in the pay of the mine-owners. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman ask them what they did in their own country? Was not public opinion in America determined not to allow the importation of Chinese labour? Where they had low-grade mines in America they worked them by machinery purchased at great cost; but in Africa, where labour was to be had for almost nothing, it was cheaper to employ it than to expend capital in machinery. It was the old old story in favour of slave labour. In this country they had been endeavouring to raise the *status* of the working man; and he could not understand that what was right and proper here should not also be right and proper in the Transvaal. The right hon. Gentleman said that the whole future of the Transvaal depended upon cheap labour. He said, perish the Transvaal and all its mines rather than they should allow such a step to be taken as long as they were responsible. Cape Colony, Natal, and Canada had their own laws with reference to labour. This country was not responsible for that; but as long as the Transvaal remained a Crown Colony it would be responsible. Forced labour was thrown upon these people by a mode of taxation for raising the revenue. The right hon. Gentleman had said, as to getting more labour from other parts of South Africa, that the blacks preferred to work above rather than underground, and that so many had been taken for the purposes of navvying and other work that it was hopeless to expect there would be enough for the requirements of the mines. Therefore, the right hon. Gentleman had approved of their ransacking the whole of Africa to get men to work in the mines, and he had allowed as an experiment 1,000 men to be imported into South Africa from Nyassaland. These poor people had no one to protect them. In Uganda and other places where they were more civilised they had protection, and in those places, when any suggestion was made of taking men to South Africa, loud protests had been made against their being dragged away from their homes. Did anyone suppose when these poor creatures were asked to sign a contract that they knew anything about it? What happened was this. The person who wanted to get the 1,000 men was a speculator, like the slave merchant of old. He obtained the men, to sell them down South, in the same way as was done before slavery was abolished in America; and as was frequently done in South Africa under the Boer *régime*, when gangs of blacks were taken down by a man who put them up to auction to the mine owners The chief from whom they were hired would get a certain sum, and these unfortunate people would know it would go hard with them if they did not obey their chief; they would go down and be shipped away, and the same thing would happen to them as happened to negroes shipped to South America in the past. The same arguments as to the blessings of civilisation which they would receive were used in that case, but at the bottom of both arguments lay the same fact, that the capitalists wanted themselves to regulate the wages and make them as small as possible because, obviously, the lower the wages the greater the profits they would receive.

In support of forced black labour the report of the Commission on Mines in Johannesburg urged that if English miners came out they would bring their obnoxious trade union views with them. But were we to abjure the doctrine of trade unionism? The great point urged in favour of forced labour was that the English miners would get higher wages and that their trades unions would see that they did get them. These poor creatures would be forced to work in the first place, and, in the second, would be compelled to work at wages which the capitalist would fix. He much regretted the attitude taken by the right hon. Gentleman on this matter. A Conservative friend of his who had gone down to the recent election at Rye, and who had been speaking to him about the election, in answer to his inquiry as to how such a result had happened, said that it was owing to the attitude of the villagers, who were indignant at the idea that the present Government were forcing blacks to work. He admitted that their action was not entirely governed by the abstract morality of that matter, because one gentleman had complained that they were earning 12s. or 14s. a week, and that they had been told that if they went out to South Africa they could make £20 or £30 a week, but they were unable to do so because the British Government were allowing slavery in that country. He had not alluded to that election for mere electioneering purposes, he took a much higher ground, that they ought not to abrogate their noblest traditions. There was nothing of which they ought to be more proud than their action on the question of slavery. It was they who put an end to the slave trade, but they were now going back on their noblest traditions, and, for the benefit o a miserable set of cosmopolitan adventurers, were allowing slavery in a country which they had annexed and which was now a Crown Colony.

*SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee) compared the state of affairs in South Africa with that of the State of Nevada twenty or thirty years ago, when the silver mines were highly productive, and were yielding large returns, and thereby contributing to the wealth of the world. There was no scarcity of white labour there, because the mine owners, making large profits for themselves, did not grudge adequate wages to their workpeople. The mine owners there might have resorted to three sources of supply for cheap labour, the negroes in the South, the Aborigines in the reservations, and the Chinese in San Francisco. To their credit it must be said they resorted to none of them, and, although they wielded great influence in the Congress and the

Senate, they made no efforts to induce forced labour, but paid such wages as insured a sufficient supply of white labour for the mines. Such views might well be taken into consideration in South Africa. Everybody knew of the enormous wealth the mines produced, and a sufficient rate of wages ought to be paid to procure white labour there. He was glad to hear the right hon. Gentleman's assurance that the mine owners did not desire to import the yellow peril into South Africa. He trusted there would be a continuance of this state of feeling on the subject, and he also hoped that the people of this country would adopt only one note and tone on this question, namely, that those who were extracting so much of the mineral wealth of South Africa should not desire merely to pay large dividends to shareholders in this country, but also that they should satisfy the claims of the miners who aided in procuring it. If this were done he believed this question of forced labour would entirely disappear, and it should disappear, because of the moral feeling of the whole of the sensible people in this country that they were not to enrich themselves, or allow other people to enrich themselves, at the expense of any labour, whether it be white, yellow, or black.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) said the Colonial Secretary had avoided giving the assurance which had been sought from that side of the House. They quite recognised that the lower-grade gold mines could not be worked without native labour, and they agreed that it was right to tax the natives for the benefits they enjoyed. It was true that they submitted to taxation in this country, but it was not imposed for the purpose of driving them to any employment to which they did not wish to go. What they believed on that side of the House, on the strength of the statements made by the capitalists themselves, was that they (the capitalists) desired to make use of taxation as an engine to compel the natives to go into the mines, and the assurance they desired to have from the Colonial Secretary was that he did not agree to that proposal, nor was disposed to entertain the principle that taxation should be exacted from the natives with a view of using it as an engine to force them into the mines. If the tax was only intended to compel the natives to contribute their portion towards the cost of Government, why was there all this anxiety on the part of mine owners? Why did they talk about the polygamist native? Did the right hon. Gentleman ask them to believe that there was no attempt or design on the part of mine owners to use taxation as a means of driving the natives into the mines? If the right hon. Gentleman said there was no such design, and that he would not countenance such a thing, then they would be satisfied. But short of giving them that assurance the right hon. Gentleman was simply evading the question when he talked about the necessity for taxation. They were aware that the natives were taxed in other countries, but in no other country were they taxed with a view of forcing them into the mines, and this was what they called forced labour. The Colonial Secretary ought to give them a clear and explicit assurance on that point. In reply to his hon. friend, the Colonial Secretary had declined to enter into the discussion of a private conversation he had had with the Rev. Mr. Bosman, but the right hon. Gentleman had disclosed a private conversation of much greater importance with General Delarey. The Colonial Secretary said he was entertained by him in his own house, and in that conversation General Delarey expressed his readiness to take part in the Legislative Council; but after he had seen General Smuts and others, he seemed to withdraw from that position, and he came to the decision that he would not sit upon the Legislative Council. Was not that a private conversation?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Certainly not. I immediately communicated that information to Lord Milner, and there was no secret about it at all.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS said he failed to see why the conversation with Mr. Bosman should be treated as private, because the rev. gentleman had communicated information with regard to it to the Press.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Does the hon. Member say that Mr. Bosman has communicated an account of his interview with me to the Press?

MR. BRYN ROBERTS said he did not say that.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Has the hon. Member himself seen an account in the Press of our conversation which has been communicated by Mr. Bosman?

MR. BRYN ROBERTS said he had seen communications in the Press which appeared as statements emanating from the Rev. Mr. Bosman. [AN HON. MEMBER: "You said he communicated them."] No, what he said was that he understood the Rev. Mr. Bosman had made communications to the Press as to the subject of his conversation with the Colonial Secretary, and those communications must have come either from one or the other. He wished to know, in view of the damage which the right hon. Gentleman now knew had been done by the destruction of private property in South Africa, whether he was ready, on behalf of the Government, to make some compensation for that destruction. The obligation of compensating those who had had their property destroyed was an obligation binding upon them by international usage and international law, but when the right hon. Gentleman was challenged upon this he seemed to suggest that the damage done was very slight. In the speech which the right hon. Gentleman made at the Johannesburg Stock Exchange, he admitted that the country had been devastated and depopulated, and the extent of the injury done was now beyond all dispute. The Boer Generals, in their appeal, stated that they were convinced from personal knowledge that 30,000 houses on the farms, besides a number of villages, had been destroyed by the British. That had been admitted and proved by the corroborative testimony of British soldiers who had fought in the war. That was confirmed by the famous letter of Lieutenant Morris. The same thing might be said of the testimony of Captain Marsh-Phillips. The hon. Member was proceeding to read a quotation with regard to farm-burning, when—

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN reminded him that these matters were consequent on the action of the war, and had nothing to do with the Colonial Office.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS said he was putting them forward simply as affecting the right to compensation. These farms were burnt, not for treachery on the part of the Boers, but in the course of military operations, contrary to international usage, and the owners ought therefore to be compensated. There were matters in connection with the usages of war which could not be compensated for, but these were not among them. They certainly constituted a breach of the Hague Convention.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member could not discuss the Hague Convention on this Vote.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS said that his contention was that if the matters of which he complained were contrary to the Hague Convention, those who suffered under them were entitled to compensation. But even putting aside the question of right, it would be a wise policy on our part to compensate these people. To offer money as an eleemosynary gift was simply adding insult to injury. As a nation which professed to be civilised and Christian, and which set some store on its honour and good name, we ought to give these people that to which they had a right, and not either leave them to starve or pauperise them by doles.

EDUCATION.

*DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.), referring to the Vote for the Board of Education, said that in the course of the discussion on the Education Bill he moved an Amendment providing that school teachers should not be compelled to undertake certain extraneous duties. On the understanding that the Government would deal with the matter in the Code he withdrew the Amendment, and the new Code having now been issued, he wished to acknowledge the manner in which the Government had carried out its undertaking. But there were one or two other matters to which he desired to refer. Hitherto the Code had been based on the exigencies of a system under which half the schools were maintained by voluntary contributions. Under the Act of last year that system had disappeared, and he should have thought that fact would have led the Board materially to revise some portions of the Code. In connection with elementary schools there were some thousands of teachers known as "Article 68," whose only necessary qualifications, according to a description which had been given in that House, were that they should be over eighteen years of age, and should have been vaccinated. The late Vice-President of the Council had several times stated that it was his poverty and not his will that consented to allow this state of things to continue. He had hoped that under the new system a start would have been made to improve the qualifications of the teachers, and that it would have been laid down that after a certain date no further appointments should be made under Article 68. He noticed, however, that the Code was described as "provisional," and that early next year, or before, the Board of Education intended to replace it by a document more in keeping with the altered state of affairs. The Board had doubtless been very hard at work in putting into operation schemes under the Act, so that he must not complain if they had not yet revolutionised the Code. He simply expressed his regret that no limitation had been placed on "Article 68," and he hoped that before long the Code would be brought more into keeping with the new condition of things under the recent Act.

He next called attention to the attempt which was being made to introduce a purely military system of drill in all the elementary schools of England and Wales. While in favour of physical training for children, he insisted that it should be carefully graduated and designed so as to be fitted to the physique of juveniles. Last year the Board of Education issued to all the schools in the country an official copy of a "Model Course of Physical Training," which he recognised as an old friend, the Red Book, which contained the instruction for drilling Army recruits. It was, however, very unintelligently prepared, for the earlier part of the infantry drill book for recruits in the Army had simply been adopted, with a few verbal alterations to suit scholars. This was the instruction in the Infantry Drill Book:—

> "Before the squad is put in motion, the instructor will take care that the men are square individually and in correct line with each other. Each recruit must be taught to take a point straight to his front, by fixing his eyes upon some distant object and then observing some nearer point in the same straight line, such as a stone, tuft of grass, or other object."

This was the instructon in regard to "squad-marching" in the "Model course of Physical Training."

> "Before the squad is put in motion, the teacher will take care that the scholars are square individually and in correct line with each other. Each scholar must be taught to take up a straight line to his front, by fixing his eyes upon some object on the ground straight to his front; and then observing some nearer point in the same straight line, such as a stone or other object."

As showing that the work of adapting the instruction in the Red Book to school purposes had been done unintelligently, he pointed out that in the portion under the heading "Exercises with Staves," the word "staff" had been substituted for "rifle," but the instruction referred to the butt end of the staff. He thought a child might fairly ask what was the butt end of a staff. There was nothing particularly wrong with the Red Book as a course of physical training for soldiers, but his contention was, that it was not suited for school children. The physical training in this book consisted of about 75 per cent. of leg exercises, and 25 per cent. of arm exercises; but there were no exercises for the muscles of the neck, the side, the abdomen, the chest, and above all, there were no breathing exercises. A more nonsensical system could not be devised for scholars, and he maintained that several of the exercises were absolutely harmful. By way of illustration he cited the gymnastic march, which was suited for a recruit with a soleless shoe in a gymnasium, but absolutely unsuited for a child having a heel to his boot on an asphalt floor. There was an instruction which was optional, entitled, "Pressing from the Ground." The child was to lie prone, face downwards, resting on the palms of the hands and the tips of the toes only, the body to be moved up and down by straightening the elbows. For a child with a weak spine that was positively harmful. He asked the Committee to imagine the case of a staid, motherly school-mistress in ordinary walking costume going through the prone exercises and carrying out the following instruction—

> "Keeping the arms perpendicular, shoot the legs to the rear, the head, body and legs assuming a rigid and straight line, and the weight of the body resting on the hands and toes only."

He confessed that he did not wish to pursue this matter too closely. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education had been industriously endeavouring to acquaint himself personally with the details of his office, and he would recommend him to go out into the Lobby and show hon. Members how the exercise could be done. Colonel Onslow, the author of this drill book, had stated that it was never intended to be used for the training of young children, nor was it suitable for that purpose. But this model course of training was being pushed very vigorously in the schools. He thought that he found the true inwardness of this attempt to insist upon military drill in the schools in a series of articles which *The Times* had published recently on the problem of the Army. Throughout these articles there breathed the spirit that it was necessary to associate the school with the Army. Personally he objected to that idea very strongly. They had no right to compel a working man to send his children to school with the object of recruiting them for the Army in the school playground. In one of those articles the writer said :

> "Some system of elementary military training, including the use of the rifle, should be introduced in all schools in order to lay the foundations of a military spirit in the nation."

To that suggestion he objected entirely. He was not squeamish in regard to the Army. He was born and brought up in the Army, and was the son of a soldier, and he wanted to get physical training for the young. But what he objected to was that this was an obvious endeavour to make the schoolsa recruiting ground for the Army. He knew he was on perfectly safe ground when he said that, and he found in the circular about the model course no less than a letter signed "General T. Kelly-Kenny, Adjutant-General." What had General Kelly-Kenny got to do with the Board of Education ? The General in that letter, which was addressed to officers commanding districts, said that he had been directed by the Commander-in-Chief to inform the Board of Education that a model form of physical training had after consultation with the War Office been proposed for the use of schools under the jurisdiction of the Board of Education, and that it was highly desirable that the teachers should be instructed in that course. Lord Roberts had approved of facilities being offered to all school managers for the practical training of teachers, and he had been requested to make the necessary arrangements about classes. Managers should, therefore, apply for the services of non-commissioned officers to give instruction to the teachers. The teachers were to go to some drill shed or gymnasium to undergo the exercises. That read to him that the difficulties and the objectionable nature—from a woman's point of view—of this particular form of military drill, had been, when all was said and done, entirely overlooked; although it was being pushed to a large extent in the country. He knew that the Inspectors of schools had been instructed not to push it in regard to women teachers, but that was not enough. He wanted the scheme to be put aside altogether as being thoroughly bad; and he objected to it further, that it was an obvious endeavour to link the schools with the Army. The Royal Commission on physical training in Scotland had reported a few days ago, and one of their recommendations was as follows :—

> "While we are unwilling to confine teachers unduly to a hard and fast system, we think that certain principles should be carefully observed, and fundamental uniformity of method, and convenience of organisation maintained. We have recommended the appointment of a skilled Committee to prepare, under the auspices of the Education Department, a model course for a national system of physical training for Scotland. We hold that a daily amount of school time should, so far as possible, be devoted to physical exercises; short periods of exercise at frequent intervals being preferable to periods of longer duration at greater intervals."

He wanted to urge the acceptance of that recommendation by the Board of Education. He agreed that they should get together a Committee consisting of a medical man, a practical School Inspector, an instructor in a gymnasium, and a woman, to frame a first-class model course, which, if sent down to the schools by the Board, would be adopted right and left. If he could get that assurance he would not take any further action.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item, Class 4, Vote 1 (Board of Education), be reduced by £100."—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said he should like to associate himself with the observations which the hon. Member for Camberwell had made on this question, because he regarded the ssue of this new programme as to drill in the schools, as a distinctly retrograde step in the matter of physical education. He did not at all blame his hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education; he thought the scheme had been issued without his knowledge or approbation, and he had no doubt that now the right hon. Gentleman's attention had been drawn to it by the discussion in the House the matter would be examined, and he felt confident that an Amendment, such as had been indicated by the hon. Member for Camberwell, would be made. Whoever issued this programme forgot a great many things that ought to have been remembered. They forgot that a great many of the children in the schools were of very tender age—with very weak bones, and muscles not developed, and that the sort of drill which was very suitable to a strong plough-boy fresh from the plough was utterly unsuitable to these little children with their weak frames. They also forgot that more than half the children in the schools were girls. He did not know whether the drill sergeants were aware that girls were not anatomically constructed in the same ways as boys, or that girls wore very different clothes from boys. All kinds of bodily motions were affected by the dress the children wore, and the illustration given by the hon. Member for Camberwell as to what women were expected to go through, obviously showed that what might very well be suited to a man was utterly unsuited to a woman because of the clothes she wore. He thought it was a great backward step in physical education to attempt to treat little girls in the same way as boys.

Another thing which seemed to have been forgotten was that physical exercises were almost universal, at any rate in the town schools; while in country schools to which the children had often to walk considerable distances, it was cruel to make the little ones go through a number of physical exercises which they were unable to bear up under. Another thing that had been forgotten was that in the elementary schools there were a number of teachers, both men and women, who were highly qualified to give physical exercises to children. This subject was much cultivated in foreign countries, especially in Switzerland and Sweden. In Sweden there was a system known as Swedish Drill, founded on scientific principles, by which the muscles which ought to be developed were exercised—for instance, the muscles of the lungs, which were exercised while breathing. Many of the teachers in English elementary schools had spent a very considerable time in learning that method, and were really much more fit to teach the military authorities than the military authorities were to teach them. There was a strong objection to apply the new programme even to the bigger boys of over twelve years of age. He was anxious that every boy in the schools should become a Volunteer, but this programme did not assist that object. There was an extraordinary charm to some boys about the idea of military drill, but to undergo it was somewhat disenchanting, and if military drill was given to boys of fourteen or fifteen it would disgust them with military exercises, and before they reached the age of seventeen or eighteen they would find that they had had enough of them, and in all likelihood would refuse to join the Volunteers. He approved of the military spirit being cultivated to the extent that our young men should aspire to defend our own shores, and for that reason he did not agree with the argument of the hon. Member for Camberwell. He hoped the Secretary to the Board of Education would seriously consider this matter and see the pro priety of appointing a Committee to frame a model course as suggested by the Scottish Royal Commission. He thought it was an extreme drawback that that Commission had not a woman on it as a member.

He wanted to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education what steps were being taken to organise and co-ordinate the Inspectors' staff. In his official days he had told the House of Commons, and he repeated now, that the whole effect of the Board of Education on the schools of the country depended on the excellence of the inspection, and that was more than ever necessary now that the schools had been handed over to the local authorities. He was glad to see that the Government had appointed Mr. Jackson as the head of the Inspectorate at Whitehall. Mr. Jackson had been for a very long time a member of the London School Board, and engaged in a great number of organisations connected with the schools, such as the Children's Holiday Fund. For the last few years he had been organising the whole of education in West Australia, and so satisfied were the Governments of the other Australian Colonies with the system he had introduced that they had sent their own education officials to inspect it. He was glad that that gentleman had been appointed; but he was sorry that he had only been appointed head of the Inspectorate of the elementary branch. He wished to know whether any progress was being made towards reorganising the whole of the Inspectorate of the Department, so that it might be under one head.

In the Board of Education a very great variety of inspectors was necessary, because there was a great variety of schools and teaching. There was the so-called infants' school, which, in his opinion, was a nurse school. Such schools ought to have women inspectors, because no man really knew how babies should be treated, or could find out how they were getting on. There ought, undoubtedly, to be women inspectors for that purpose. Then there were the elementary schools, secondary schools, and higher-grade schools, all of which required different attainments on the part of the inspectors. They could not divide the schools to be inspected into elementary and secondary schools; because there was some secondary education going on in all the large elementary schools, and some technical work also. In former days, the elementary education in such schools was inspected by an inspector who shut his eyes to the secondary and technical education, whereas the secondary and technical education was inspected by an inspector who shut his eyes to the elementary work. To have the schools thoroughly inspected it was necessary to have inspectors of attainment and responsibility under one superior officer. They should also remember that now that the local authority was the education authority, they would undoubtedly have more schools in the future in which technical, secondary, and elementary education were mixed, than they had at the present time; and it was most important, therefore, that the local authorities should have one official with whom they could communicate, and not have to communicate with two or three branches in order that a school might be inspected as a whole. He should feel obliged if his hon. friend would inform the House what progress was being made in that matter; and how far the services of Mr. Jackson were available for inspection in directions other than elementary.

MR. BRYCE said he wished to refer to the action which the Board of Education had taken with reference to the Act of last session. The Committee would remember that under that Act a number of schemes were to be framed by the local authorities, and were to be submitted to the Board of Education. He had heard from a considerable number of local bodies that the Board of Education was endeavouring to hurry them, indeed to hustle them, to accept schemes somewhat hastily, and were undoubtedly putting pressure upon them. The local authorities believed that the Board of Education was anxious they should pass the schemes at once, and further that the Board was endeavouring to induce them to adopt its own views as to what the schemes should be. The reports which had reached him received some confirmation from the circulars which had been issued by the Board. The Board had shown a spasmodic and feverish activity in issuing a number of circulars to the local authorities. It was quite right that the Board should convey information to the local authorities with regard to the provisions of the Act, and its legal interpretation. No one would complain of that; and they would all be glad that the local authorities should have the benefit of the legal knowledge which the Board had at its command. But those circulars went somewhat further. They were not confined to clearing up difficulties in the interpretation of the Act, and with giving information; they went on to advise, and to suggest what were the wishes of the Board; and they rather indicated that it would be the duty of the local authorities to fall in with the views the Board might be pleased to express. The Committee would feel that it was the duty of a Government Department to sail on an absolutely even keel in matters which were controversial, and regarding which great differences of opinion were known to exist. It ought to be absolutely dispassionate and impartial as between the different parties, sects, views and tendencies in this country. When a Government Department left this impartial attitude, and began to indicate views which were well known to be the views of a particular section, or a particular party, it destroyed some of that confidence which it ought to obtain from the whole community. He did not say that the Board had done anything more than indicate a tendency to partiality. He did not impeach the Board; and he was sure that his hon. friend the Secretary to the Board had every desire to be impartial; but he thought that if the Committee were to read several of the circulars which had been issued, they would see that, both by suggestion and omission, the Board at any rate appeared to depart from that impartial attitude which it ought to have adopted. That applied to Circular number 470a sent out to County Councils, and to Circular 470b sent out to Borough Councils. Section 5 of that Circular was taken by some of the local authorities as endeavouring to convey the view of the Board of Education that representatives of associations of denominational schools ought to form part of the Committees. That was not stated in so many words, but the Circular implied that that was the wish and desire of the Board. That was a suggestion which he thought would have been better omitted. Then Circular 472 suggested that the local managers and trustees ought to endeavour to form a common fund out of the Aid Grant, and reference was made to Schedule 2 of the Act, which, by the way, they were not permitted to discuss. The Circular went on to say that the governing body of an association of voluntary schools was an organisation which was well adapted for the administration of a common fund. That seemed to him to be going beyond what the Act authorised. The natural interpretation to be put on the Act was that these associations of voluntary schools would come to an end under it; but the Circular suggested that they should be kept up, and be appointed managers of a common fund. That really went beyond anything which the Act authorised. The object of the Board should be to carry out the Act fairly, and not to keep up sectarian organisations. He thought it would be a great misfortune if the local authorities were to be prevented from doing their work in the best way; and it would be regrettable if the idea got abroad that the object of the Board was to endeavour to keep up sectarian organisations.

There were also points which the Board of Education had omitted to which they might have called attention. A circular had been issued to the private owners of schools in which a number of alternatives had been suggested as to the way in which they might deal with the schools which were now in their hands. Those schools were 10 per cent. of the voluntary schools, and were therefore an important element of the voluntary schools of the country. This circular suggested various plans by which the school owners could hand over these schools to the managers, so that their denominational character could be imparted to them, but the reference to handing the schools over to the local authority under Section 17 of the Act of 1870 was made in such a way as to imply that that was the last thing the owner should think of. If the Board of Education had wished to give full information, the proper course would have been to have copied out the section of the Act of 1870, and have shown how elastic it was, and what opportunities it afforded to private owners to hand over their schools, for some purposes, to the local authority, and still retain their private rights. He regretted the Board of Education had not made that more precise, and also suggested to the private owner that there was a way in which he might hand over his school to the local authority, to the great advantage of the general system of education in this country, and still retain a limited control over the school. And he could not help wishing that the local authority also had received some guidance from the Board of Education with regard to secondary education.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said he rose to support the hon. Member for North Camberwell in the speech he had made in regard to physical training. The reason he did so was that he had had the pleasure, in March 1901, in company with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, to take up a similar line with regard to the attempt to impose military drill in all elementary schools. It counted for righteousness that when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University was in office he took the same view as he now took when sitting below the gangway. That was a fact sufficiently important to be mentioned, and sufficiently exceptional to become historic. On that occasion, it was as well for the Committee to know, the right hon. Gentleman was supported by the common-sense of the House of Commons. To-night there had been a tacit agreement among all Members, including even the military Members, that the suggestions of the hon. Member for Camberwell ought to be remitted to a Committee, on the lines of the Scotch Committee on physical education. If that were done, many defects would be removed, and they would have a code of drill properly fitted to the children's physique rather than the soldier's order book. He believed, in its proper sphere, Colonel Fox's method was one of the best pieces of work ever done for the physical improvement of the soldier and the recruit. He had had an opportunity of seeing its working frequently at Aldershot, and the splendid result of it. Colonel Fox had done great things to improve the physique of the soldier, but some of those who had been under him expressed the opinion that he had overdone it. But good as that code might be for young, strong, active men, it was incompatible with infant training, and he trusted that the hon. Member for North Camberwell would get what he demanded. In many cases children who attended the Board Schools were not well formed and, unfortunately, in many cases were insufficiently fed and physically incapable of performing two military drills in the school in addition to their play. He spoke with a practical knowledge on this subject, as a governor of a polytechnic which had 4,000 students. There he found that in proportion as they did away with the military drill, and adopted the Swiss and Swedish drills, so the children improved. He deprecated this attempt on the part of military men to make our elementary schools a recruiting ground for the Army; that it did not pay was shown by the *Army and Navy Gazette*, which discouraged these attempts on the ground that instead of making the Army attractive and making children fond of the Army, it had entirely the opposite effect. What it did, in fact, was to repel the children from the Army and, generally speaking, to defeat the very object they had in view.

The hon. Member was still speaking when the House adjourned.

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

LONDON UNITED TRAMWAYS BILL [BY ORDER].

[SECOND READING.]

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) moved "That this Bill be read a second time this day six months." He said this was certainly a Bill which ought to be referred to the Royal Commission which had been appointed to inquire into the question of London traffic and locomotion. This was a Bill which was not brought in in the public interest, but for purposes of private profit, and sought for certain powers, among others, to widen certain streets on the route it served. At the present time, the middle of the streets served by this Company, were practically rendered not only unsafe, but positively dangerous and almost unpassable, without regard to the safety of either the pedestrians or the traffic which used them, and they did not provide stations for their passengers. Therefore, quite apart from this Bill being one of those which ought to go to the consideration of the Royal Commission, he urged that this Company should not be given any further powers until they had taken means to relieve the congestion at their *termini*, and this could only be done by their acquiring land on which they could erect stations at which to take up and set down their passengers. Another and equally good reason why the Second Reading of this Bill should not receive the assent of the House, was that this Company had not yet, under their Act of last year, proceeded with their Hammersmith and Richmond scheme. It was a curious fact that the public Press had no record of the many accidents which occurred on the tramway service of this Company. It was a matter of common report that accidents occurred daily, but such was the astuteness of the officials of the Company that they always managed somehow to suppress the facts and prevent them being published.

Anyone who desired a unified system for all London, and had watched the career of this Company, would notice that the cleverness of the promoters of this Bill had been shown by the fact that they had recognised that they had to deal with a large number of small local authorities in and around London whose officers were no match for the skill and cunning of the gentlemen who represented the Company. If one other argument were necessary to ensure this Bill being sent to the Railway Commission, it was to be found in the fact that throughout this and similar schemes the President of the Board of Trade had been incompetent to protect public interests, and that therefore the Company had been able to secure rights without any protection being given to the needs of the general traffic. He called attention to the fact that at the end of last session a very remarkable discussion took place in respect to what had occurred in a Committee room with regard to a scheme that was intimately allied to and formed part of the system of tramways which this Bill was designed to carry on. The promoters of those Bills and of this Bill were practically the same persons. There was last year a scandal with regard to private Bill legislation such as had never been known in this House. The House therefore should regard with very suspicious scrutiny any proposals which these promoters submitted to the House.

*MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) said this Bill was not one of those which ought to be postponed until the Commission had reported, for the reason that it did not provide in any way for new tramways, but merely provided for widening certain streets in compliance with the pledges given by the Company to the House and to the local authorities. He should have thought that the question of widening streets was more a matter for the Committee upstairs to which this Bill ought to go rather than a reason for postponing the Bill until the result of the Royal Commission was ascertained. He did not see the necessity, therefore, to postpone the Second Reading, and he hoped his hon. friend would not press the matter.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said he desired to point out to the hon. Gentleman who proposed the rejection of the Bill that such action was absolutely inconsistent with the attitude he had taken up with regard to the City and North-East Suburban Electric Railway Bill which was lately before the House. On that occasion the hon. Gentleman asked that the Bill, which dealt with a line twenty-two-and-a-half miles in length, which in his (Mr. Burns'), opinion ought to have been postponed, should be read a second time, whilst in this case he asked for the rejection of the Measure. How the hon. Gentleman could reconcile those two attitudes he did not know.

Read a second time and committed.

SUPPLY [2ND ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee,)

CIVIL SERVICE AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1903-4 (VOTE ON ACCOUNT).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £20,265,000, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for or towards defraying the charges for the following Civil Service and Revenue Departments for the year ending 31st March, viz.—

Civil Services.

CLASS II.

	£
Colonial Office - - -	25,000

CLASS IV.

Board of Education - -	6,000,000

CLASS II.

Board of Agriculture - -	65,000

CLASS III.

Crofters Commission, Scotland	2,000

CLASS I.

Royal Palaces and Marlborough House - -	40,000
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens - - -	50,000
Houses of Parliament Buildings - - -	16,000
Miscellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain - - -	30,000
Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain - - -	20,000
Diplomatic and Consular Buildings - - -	18,000
Revenue Buildings - - -	225,000
Public Buildings, Great Britain -	225,000
Surveys of the United Kingdom	90,000
Harbours under the Board of Trade - - -	7,000
Peterhead Harbour - - -	6,000
Rates on Government Property -	250,000
Public Works and Buildings, Ireland - - -	110,000
Railways, Ireland - - -	80,000

CLASS II.

United Kingdom and England :—

	£
House of Lords Offices - -	2,000
House of Commons Offices - -	12,000
Treasury and Subordinate Departments - - -	40,000
Home Office - - - -	60,000
Foreign Office - - - -	30,000
Privy Council Office, &c. - -	5,000
Board of Trade - - -	75,000
Mercantile Marine Services -	30,000
Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade - - -	3
Charity Commission - - -	15,000
Civil Service Commission - -	18,000
Exchequer and Audit Department - - - -	25,000
Friendly Societies Registry -	3,000
Local Government Board - -	85,000
Lunacy Commission - - -	5,000
Mint (including Coinage) - -	5
National Debt Office - - -	6,000
Public Record Office - - -	10,000
Public Works Loan Commission	5
Registrar General's Office - -	19,000
Stationery and Printing - -	320,000
Woods, Forests, &c., Office of -	8,000
Works and Public Buildings, Office of - - - -	30,000
Secret Service - - - -	40,000

Scotland :—

Secretary for Scotland - -	25,000
Fishery Board - - - -	8,000
Lunacy Commission - - -	3,000
Registrar General's Office - -	5,000
Local Government Board - -	6,000

Ireland :—

Lord Lieutenant's Household -	2,000
Chief Secretary for Ireland -	16,000
Department of Agriculture -	75,000
Charitable Donations and Bequests Office - - -	1,000
Local Government Board - -	25,000
Public Record Office - - -	2,000
Public Works Office - - -	18,000
Registrar General's Office - -	6,000
Valuation and Boundary Survey	7,000

CLASS III.

United Kingdom and England :—

Law Charges - - - -	35,000
Miscellaneous Legal Expenses -	27,000
Supreme Court of Judicature -	140,000
Land Registry - - - -	20,000
County Courts - - - -	8,000
Police, England and Wales -	18,000

	£
Prisons, England and the Colonies	340,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain	140,000
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum	14,000

Scotland :—

Law Charges and Courts of Law	30,000
Register House, Edinburgh	15,000
Prisons, Scotland	40,000

Ireland :—

Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions	35,000
Supreme Court of Judicature, and other Legal Departments	45,000
Land Commission	55,000
County Court Officers, &c.	46,000
Dublin Metropolitan Police	45,000
Royal Irish Constabulary	600,000
Prisons, Ireland	50,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools	55,000
Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum	3,000

CLASS IV.

United Kingdom and England :—

British Museum	80,000
National Gallery	10,000
National Portrait Gallery	3,000
Wallace Collection	4,000
Scientific Investigation, &c., United Kingdom	22,000
Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales	42,000

Scotland :—

Public Education	750,000
National Gallery	3,000

Ireland :—

Public Education	730,000
Endowed Schools Commissioners	400
National Gallery	3,000
Queen's Colleges	2,500

CLASS V.

	£
Diplomatic and Consular Services	250,000
Uganda, Central and East Africa Protectorates, and Uganda Railway	320,000
Colonial Services	300,000
Cyprus, Grant in Aid	85,000
Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable	32,000

CLASS VI.

Superannuation and Retired Allowances	280,000
Merchant Seaman's Fund Pensions, etc.	2,000
Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances	1,000
Hospitals and Charities, Ireland	17,000

CLASS VII.

Temporary Commissions	25,000
Miscellaneous Expenses	16,087
Repayments to the Local Loans Fund	— —
St. Louis Exhibition, 1904	— —
Total for Civil Services	£13,035,000

Revenue Departments:—

Customs	350,000
Inland Revenue	830,000
Post Office	3,800,000
Post Office Packet Service	250,000
Post Office Telegraphs	2,000,000
Total for Revenue Departments	£7,230,000
Grand Total	£20,265,000

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item, Class 4, Vote 1 (Board of Education) be reduced by £100."—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

MR. JOHN BURNS, continuing his remarks, said the dearth of officers in the Army was due to the fact that very often in public schools the students were so fed up with the routine and monotony of military drill in the cadet corps that it sickened their military aspirations for the rest of their lives. If it were true that Waterloo was won on the playing field of Eton, that was in itself a condemnation of this particular idea. because it showed that if a man had brains and courage he would find in the hour of need that the adaptability produced by gymnastic exercises was more valuable to him than the results of monotonous military drill. He thought the training of children should be regulated by their strength, and should be in accordance with the desires of their parents. If the Code now under discussion were imposed on the elementary schools, it would, he believed, be resented and some parents would withdraw their children from its operation. It was a mistake to attempt to inculcate drill so early in life. It would be better to have children taught how to breathe, develop themselves, masticate their food, wash their teeth—and their language in some localities—swim, and so forth, and to see that their parents obtained sufficient wages to provide them with good nourishment. When Colonel Onslow said that this particular system of drill was not fit for children, he submitted that the hon. Member for North Camberwell had high authority for asking that the whole matter should be submitted to a Committee. If the hon. Baronet persisted in carrying out War Office tactics and skirmishing proceedings for boys and girls under thirteen years of age, he would make more pro-Boers of parents than he imagined. Military drill and violent physical training should be confined to recruits and soldiers. If the Board desired to make the children smarter, cleaner, and more punctual, and to develop their bodies, instead of consulting a committee of drill sergeants they should take the advice of a small committee of doctors, schoolmasters, and schoolmistresses. He would lose no opportunity of protesting against the attempt to militarise instruction, and to impose upon physically weak children a method of training which, instead of doing good, would, in the majority of cases, do physical and moral harm.

Mr HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) suggested that the physical training course, which he did not believe had been introduced with any sinister motives, should not be pursued according to a uniform and cast-iron system. He was glad to see that modifications had been introduced into the Code, but they did not go far enough. The alternative courses ought certainly to be optional in every school, particularly in rural districts. The question of physical training was a very different one as affecting rural and urban schools. In the slums of big towns, the physique of the children was such that a great deal more of these active exercises were required during school hours, than was the case in the country, where the children had plenty of opportunities for fresh air and exercise. Moreover, in nine cases out of ten, the head of a village school would be a schoolmistress, and it would be impossible to have a regular course of physical training. The time might come when they would be better able to do it, but at present it would be a mistake to impose upon all schools any uniform system. The conclusion he had come to, after having recently examined Colonel Fox before a committee, was that the whole subject was in a very inchoate condition, and much further consideration was required before any definite system was adopted.

The inspection of schools was a very important matter, and might prove to be the keystone of the whole system, as the efficiency of the schools would depend on the efficiency of the inspection. He sincerely hoped that the Government would, to a large extent, place their inspectors at the disposal of the local authorities. To duplicate inspection all over the country would be bad for the ratepayers and bad for the schools. He suggested that the reports of the inspectors should be placed at the disposal of the local authorities and that those reports should be communicated in full without delay. He hoped the Government would take care that the inspectors were thoroughly efficient. Too much importance had perhaps in the past been attached to the strict limit of age, as that limit might prevent the Board securing the services of really experienced men who understood school work. As to the recent circular, personally he had no reason to complain of it. The Board had given a great deal of useful guidance to the local authorities and the managers of schools, but they should not stop at the issue of circulars. Under the Act of last year the local authorities had to consult the Board in framing their schemes, and it was most important that that consultation should take the form of interviews with some really first-class men connected with the Department, who could suggest new lines of work and offer legitimate criticisms. In the matter of higher education the local authorities would require much stimulus. They would be compelled to carry out certain duties in regard to elementary education, but there would be considerable danger of the work of higher education being neglected on account of the limitation of the funds and of the energies of the authorities being taken up by the more controversial work of elementary education.

Another matter to which he wished to refer was connected with the science examinations in the training colleges. Two years ago, on the recommendation of a Departmental Committee, the Board of Education adopted a syllabus which provided, among other things, that general science teaching should in future be given from a practical and experimental point of view. He was sorry to hear that in the very first examination under the new system there was to be no practical examination in science whatever. The training colleges, almost without exception, having taken up the new syllabus *con amore*, had developed their science teaching in a very practical way, and they would be greatly discouraged by the examination being held on the old and obsolete lines. In conclusion, he congratulated the Board on the improvement which had been introduced under the new *régime*. A fresh era of improvements had been entered upon. He was glad they had taken up seriously the question of pupil teachers, that being one of the most important and pressing subjects that could engage the attention of the new local authorities, and unless they had some guidance from the Board of Education on the matter, it was possible that a great deal of their labour would be wasted or prove ineffective.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said the question of military drill and physical training was one of the greatest importance. It would be quite as easy in the country as in the large towns, if it were thought desirable, to pass all the children through some form of elementary military drill, but whether it would encourage the unfortunate children to join the Volunteers immediately on leaving school he was extremely sceptical. He could not help thinking that the remarkable document which had been so ridiculed by his hon. friend was another of the triumphs of the War Office, and that the Secretary of State for War rather than the Secretary to the Board of Education should have been present to explain it. There was this essential difference between town and country districts, that whereas in the latter mere military drill might be of very dubious advantage, even from the point of view of those who advocated it, there was no doubt that in urban districts, small and large, a carefully organised system of physical exercises was one of the greatest necessities of the day, and when the County Council Committees were fairly in the saddle, a great deal might be done in that direction. The matter was entirely one of organisation, and now that they had committees operating over large areas, it ought to be possible within a comparatively short space of time, with the aid of the Board of Education—providing obstructive circulars were not issued by the War Office—to establish a good system of physical exercises, based on really scientific principles. If a boy was strong and healthy, in nine cases out of ten he would have a natural desire to use his health and strength in the Volunteers, or in some other manner connected with military life, but if he was driven through the mill too soon he would in all probability throw up the whole thing as soon as possible.

With regard to the inspectorate, it was desirable that the intentions of the Government should be known, as the County Committees were now about to make their arrangements, and they could not tell what kind of officers to appoint or what salaries to offer until they knew how far they were to be assisted by the Government inspectors. At present there were the old elementary school inspectors, the inspectors appointed to examine secondary and technical schools, and those occupied in examining evening classes. Their districts frequently overlapped, and there was much room for organisation. By taking counties, or groups of counties, he believed much improvement could be effected in the service of the inspectorate. There had been a great deal of anxiety in regard to finances during the first two or three years under the new *régime*, and a circular had been issued explaining the intentions of the department. As that circular was a most difficult document to understand, it would be an advantage if a general statement could be made by the representative of the Board. There was one point of some importance upon which he desired to ask for some information. An attempt was being made in Church circles to form companies, which were to distribute a dividend of not more than 4 per cent. or 5 per cent., to found secondary schools with the idea that they would be entitled to receive a payment of so much per head out of the public funds, and out of the Votes of this House for education. It had been stated at a meeting of one of those companies, that the Treasury had stated that they had no intention of allowing any such payments to be made. The proposal was that the persons who put their money into a financial undertaking, which would not otherwise pay, were to receive 4 or 5 per cent. from the taxpayers. Whether that was right or wrong it was desirable that the Committee should know whether these funds were liable to be used for the purpose he had described. He hoped the reply of the Government would be that the action of the permanent officials of the Treasury would be supported by them, because otherwise an almost indefinite prospect would be opened up for educational speculation, which was an exceedingly objectionable thing, and he did not think it would be to the advantage of public education at all. Those were the points which he desired to press upon the Government. He did not wish to say anything derogatory in regard to the action of the Education Office, because, after the passing of the Education Act last year, the case had been settled against them, and he anticipated that the Education Department would in all probability do their best. If certain clauses had been used in the direction he had indicated, he assumed that it was a matter upon which they might look forward to future legislation being introduced to remedy this. With regard to the action of the County Councils generally, he believed there was every intention on their part to rise to the level of their opportunities; and although no doubt there would be some differences of opinion in regard to certain subjects, nevertheless he believed that there would be a great many subjects upon which the County Councils and the Education Office would work together harmoniously.

*MR. SHAW-STEWART (Renfrew, E.) said that as one of the Commissioners who had just reported to the House upon this question for Scotland, he should like to say a word or two in favour of the appointment of a skilled committee of men and women to draw up a model course of physical training, for England, instead of relying upon the present model course, which was to a very great extent founded upon military drill. The inquiries of the Physical Training Commission had lasted nearly twelve months, and the Commissioners were all impressed with the necessity for physical training being most carefully organised all along the line. Physical training was different to mental training, because mental training was the result of centuries of experience, but physical training for all and sundry was something new, and therefore it was necessary to have a system which was applicable to all sorts of children, well-fed and ill-fed, well clothed and ill-clothed, and devised after the most careful consideration of all the systems in vogue. The Commission examined a number of systems, including the Swiss, German, French and American systems, but they found defects in them all. The conclusion they came to was that in order to get the best out of all these systems it was not necessary to go to a military expert. Admirable as the military expert might be, and admirable as he believed Colonel Fox to be, it was not enough to go to a military expert only, and he strongly supported the suggestion from the other side that the Education Department of England should appoint a skilled committee, aided by medical experts, to draw up a model course.

That course should be of a very wide and varied description, so that it might be varied by the teachers to all classes of children, suited to all conditions of health, and to children whether in the towns or in the country. In order to ascertain the existing physical condition of the children in Scotland, they appointed two eminent medical officers to examine a large number of children, and 600 children were examined in Aberdeen schools, and 600 in Edinburgh schools, and the result of that examination showed that it was necessary that the greatest possible care should be taken in devising a system which might be applicable to all. The Commission, after full inquiry, recommended that there should be medical inspection of the children in all schools. They all hoped that the generation which was now growing up would be better fitted to bear arms for their country if necessary. The best system to enable them to efficiently bear arms was one which would develop those who were weakly as well as those who were strong. They should develop the bodies of children to the best state of efficiency to which each was capable of being developed, so that in after life they might be fitted to follow up any trade or profession, or follow the profession of arms, with the best possible advantage to their country.

*MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough) said he thought they were all agreed that it was undesirable that they should train children to become soldiers, and if his hon. friend went to a division he should support him. What he wished specially to call the attention of the House to was the excessive zeal of the Board of Education in rejecting the schemes of the County Councils, when those schemes were well within the meaning of the Act. The interference of the Board of Education in such cases was, in his opinion, unnecessary and unjustifiable, and it was unfair that the Act, which contained many inequalities and injustices, forced into it by the closure, should be so interpreted and carried into effect by the officials of the department as to make it seem more harsh. He desired to refer to a scheme formulated by the Leicestershire County Council. That scheme was absolutely within the four corners of the Act. By some means the scheme found its way to the Board of Education prior to being submitted to the County Council, and the day before the Council met a letter was received from the Board of Education, and was read by the clerk, stating that it was desirable to recast the scheme and therefore it would be better to refer the scheme to the Committee again and report to the Council in February. A good deal of time was lost and it was clear that some official or member of the County Council had been in communication with the Board of Education in an unjustifiable manner. The original scheme contained no provision for nomination by any particular bodies outside the County Council. The Committee was to consist of forty-two members: thirty-two from the County Council and ten outside.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the Leicestershire County Council did not submit any scheme at the time referred to, and as a matter of fact no scheme had been rejected by the Board of Education.

*MR. LEVY said he endeavoured to ascertain from the right hon. Gentleman how the scheme came into the possession of the Board of Education by a Question put in the House; but he could get no satisfactory reply. Instead of a Committee of forty-two members the Board of Education proposed forty-six, thirty-four from the Council, and twelve outside members. Eight bodies were also mentioned with powers to nominate—among them the University of Oxford, the University of Cambridge, the University of Birmingham, the Peterborough Diocesan Association of Voluntary Schools, the Midland Association of Wesleyan Schools and the Association of Catholic Schools. The original scheme made no provision for representation of denominational Associations. It was desired that the people nominated should be well versed in the matter of education and qualified to carry out the education scheme, irrespective of their religious opinions. People, he was convinced, would resent the unjustifiable interference with their schemes by the Board of Education, and those who had been inclined to give the Act a fair trial would probably not be inclined now to carry it out. The hon. Member proceeded to remark that the Borough Council of Loughborough had sent a scheme to London, but it had been returned, and the Loughborough Council did not feel inclined to make any drastic alterations in the scheme which they had submitted. They believed their scheme was absolutely in accordance with the Act.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: The scheme of the Loughborough Council has gone back to-day to the Council for publication in the form sent up by the Council.

*MR. LEVY said there had been an impression created that the Board of Education were altering schemes to make them admit sectarian bodies. He assured the Government that if any attempt was made to impose sectarian or denominational control it would be resented by the people of this country.

MR. ARKWRIGHT (Hereford) said he proposed to confine his remarks to the statements made by the hon. Member for North Camberwell, and he hoped the House would grant him its indulgence. He believed that the physical education of the children of this country was a very serious question, and he believed also that he was the only hon. Member of the House who had made this question an important item in his election address. In regard to what the hon. Member for Battersea had said, even if it were true that the movement for physical education in the schools had received a considerable impetus from the recent war and was to be set down partly to a spirit of militarism, it was not altogether a bad thing. But it was not entirely that. Our children did not go only into the Army or the Navy. They went equally to the plough, and one of the underlying reasons for the lamentable exodus from our rural districts was the phenomenon of sheer physical exhaustion with which the young child was met very soon after he had left school and gone to labour for which he was not fitted. He did not contend that physical education would do much to remedy this, but at any moment they were dealing with at least 2,000,000 boys, and, dealing with that mass, there surely would be, with an organised system of proper physical education, a tendency to help children to stay in the country—at any rate, there would be a general improvement in the physical condition of the children at the time when they actually left school and went to work. He did not hesitate to say that he thought it would not be at all a bad thing if the schools of this country knew more about the Army and Navy, and were actually drilled with a view to giving a certain amount of assistance in recruiting for the Army and Navy. He did not think the Secretary for the Board of Education need be ashamed of being recognised as the first and most important recruiting sergeant in this country. But, after all, it was not so much a matter for the Committee as for the Education Department itself to deal with. It was to a great extent a question of inspection and a question of administration. He thought every hon. Member who had gone into schools and had seen that extraordinary operation which was known as musical drill, must have left the school with qualms as to whether or not the right thing was being done for the children. He maintained that the idea of the teachers was that the drill had for its first object to attract and catch the eye of the examiner. The drill displayed was too often a slap-dash performance which satisfied that gentleman for a few minutes, but was not sound, and had the faults of a hybrid system. The department should deal with this drill question, but the House should lay down the criterion that no drill should be taught in the schools which a doctor would not allow his own children to undergo. That was surely a sound principle on which they should proceed in future. He hoped the hon. Member who moved the Motion would withdraw it. The debate had been long and interesting, and, he was sure, would have a good effect in enabling the country to realise that that House was giving serious attention to the matter.

*MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said the question they were now considering was not whether there should be drill in the public schools—the question was what kind of drill they were to have. Higher medical opinion, so far as it had been consulted, was against this course of drill from the physiological point of view. The Committee would have gathered from the debate that in this matter the War Office, not content with the magnificent successes in its own sphere, had poached on the preserves of the Education Department, and had again manifested that inevitable capacity for blundering which it had shown in its own proper domain. At the time when the attention of the whole country was drawn to the necessity of increasing the Auxiliary forces and the Army, it seemed to have occurred to the War Office authorities that it would be a good and a wise thing if boys from their school days upwards were trained in military drill. They seemed then to have proceeded to the Board of Education and insisted on something being put into the Code. The result was that the "Model Course of Physical Training" was issued. That course was all taken from the Red Book, applicable to recruits and private soldiers, and related chiefly to the use of the chest muscles and the bayonet. It was a matter about which the Committee had a right to complain, that the Board of Education had allowed itself to be overruled and coerced by the War Office in taking a course of that kind. Did the Board of Education propose to emulate the incapacity of the War Office in these matters? Did the Board of Education, before issuing the "Model Course," obtain medical opinion upon it, and were professors of physical culture, inspectors, and teachers of schools ever consulted on the matter? He believed the answer was in the negative, and that nothing of the sort had been done.

An alternative view was that the "Model Course" had been in some insidious way forced on the Board of Education, and that it had been brought into existence without receiving proper notice. The Committee had had that night a repudiation of responsibility for it on the part of the right hon. Baronet who was Parliamentary Secretary to the Board at the time it was issued. He thought he was therefore entitled to suppose that the War Office had insidiously succeeded in putting this "Model Course" before the country. If they had a proper "Model Course" drawn up for schools it might not be a military drill course, but he was sure it would be one providing a suitable preparatory course of drill for any career which a boy might follow in after life. If they wanted a boy to become a Volunteer when he grew up, they must not give him while at school his preparatory information in indigestible lumps. He dared say that the hon. Baronet would tell them that this "Model Course" was not compulsory. But it had been made compulsory in many districts, because of the ill-judged enthusiasm with which some of the inspectors had pressed this on. In the Code issued to-day there were some alterations and improvements which would go so far to ameliorate the condition of matters, but they would not go far enough. He urged that the question of the Model Drill course should be considered by a committee, and that in the meantime instructions should be given to the inspectors that it was not to treated as a compulsory subject. He also advocated the opening of the ranks of the inspectorate to teachers, and asked to be informed of the number of cases in which application had been made to the Board of Education for the variation of the trust deed of schools hitherto undenominational, with a view to making them denominational.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) called attention to the action of the Board of Education in reference to the High Pavement School at Nottingham. In order to meet the requirements of the Board, the children in the intermediate department had been displaced, and accommodation for 150 children had to be found. An application by the School Board to use the laundry and the gymnasium for the accommodation of these children had been refused by the Board of Education. The Board of Education refused on the ground, firstly, of the unsuitability of the buildings as at present arranged for ordinary teaching purposes. In answer to that the managers of the school on 26th February passed a resolution declaring that they were satisfied the laundry and gymnasium rooms were well adapted for the purposes of class teaching, and strongly urging the Board to sanction their use for the intermediate section. Independent testimony had been obtained as to the character of the rooms, and he was able to state that there could not be a shadow of doubt that they were far better adapted for use as a school than hundreds of schools which were at present sanctioned by the Board of Education all over the country. The second ground for refusal was that there would be disadvantages attending the necessary cessation in the higher elementary schools, of laundry work and gymnastic exercises. The Committee would be surprised to hear that the higher school was not using these rooms for laundry work and gymnastic exercises. There was, therefore, no substance in that objection. The third objection was the apparent absence of any urgent need for the use of the rooms in question for the purpose. The Board of Education explained that there was ample surplus accommodation to be found elsewhere. In this matter he wished to bring no charge against the Parliamentary Secretary or the Board of Education, but he wished to direct his charge against those persons from whom the Board of Education got information. The Board of Education suggested that the 150 children should be sent to All Saints' National School, which had vacancies for them. In answer to a question recently addressed to him, the hon. Baronet stated that that school was only half-a mile distant. As a matter of fact it was a mile distant, and it was not only inconvenient with respect to situation, but owing to the nature of the land which had to be traversed it was dangerous for the children to go there. Questions had been asked as to the character of the land through which the children had to pass, whether assaults had not been committed on children on this wholly unprotected land, and whether it had been placed under special police supervision. On all these points the hon. Baronet had been told by his informant in Nottingham that there was not the slightest ground for asking such questions.

Now, what were the facts? A simple reference to the map would have shown that the distance between the two schools was a mile, and not half-a-mile. That was not a trifling matter for children, especially girls, who had to pass over an open unprotected space with an evil repute, sometimes in the dark. What was the motive of the hon. Baronet's correspondent in giving incorrect information of that sort? On the second point, the character of the land, he had asked the hon. Baronet whether he had referred to the Chief Constable of Nottingham regarding the grave criminal assaults against children which had taken place on this land, part of which consisted of a deep ravine entirely unlighted. The great bulk of the children who attended the High Pavement School had to cross that land before they could attend All Saints' School, and it would appear from the facts, so far as the convenience and safety of the children were concerned, that it was far more desirable that they should attend the school in the neighbourhood of their own homes—that was in the temporary building—until the new school was built, rather than All Saints' School. The hon. Baronet had suggested that there were other schools besides All Saints', but from local inquiries he had made he understood that that was not so. He was therefore entitled to ask that the Board of Education should continue to allow the use of the temporary school. They all knew that the use of temporary buildings as voluntary schools had been allowed all over the country, and why in the case of a great School Board like Nottingham should the opinion of the managers be flouted, and the children be compelled to undergo the risks he had described, merely, so far as he could judge, in order to bring the children into this All Saints' School? It was not as if All Saints' was a model school. What was the report that had been made as to that school? It would be only fair that the hon. Baronet should not rely wholly on the report of an inspector whose career had caused much trouble, and had not been absolutely immaculate. The hon. Baronet should rather listen to the appeal brought before him by so important a School Board as that of Nottingham, and sanction the continued use by the School Board of the temporary school building.

*COLONEL WILLIAMS (Dorsetshire, W.) said he wished to emphasise the extreme difficulty in which County Councils were placed in regard to the financial responsibilities involved in taking over the work of the elementary schools. It was extremely difficult to raise the rate to something more than double that otherwise required, or else to borrow large sums of money which they would not be able to repay for three or four years, and on which they would have to pay considerable interest. Consequently they would have to diminish the work of the schools, and that would hamper the amount earned.

But what was much more important was that the interests of education would be prejudiced, because it was difficult enough at present to get the ratepayers to take an interest in education. If the rates were suddenly raised it would throw back the whole cause of education for many years. He therefore hoped the Treasury would be induced to come to the aid, financially, of the local authorities to enable them to bear this heavy extra burden. He also wished to refer to the question of inspection. It was often claimed that the new Act enabled all education to be graduated, but if they were going to have various systems of education encouraged by various inspectors they would never be able to know where they were. It was a very important part of the co-ordination of education that the inspection should be in the same hands and under the same trained mind; and that the whole education of a county should be controlled by one authority and inspected by one set of inspectors.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the debate had ranged over a very wide field, and he would endeavour to answer the various questions raised as fully as possible. Dealing first with the complaint of the hon. Member for Monmouthshire in regard to Nottingham, he had made special inquiries into the matter, and had ascertained that, for the credit of Nottingham, the Chief-Constable repudiated with indignation the idea that the open space referred to was more dangerous than any open space in or near any large town, and that, in fact, the charges brought against the character of that ground were unfounded. From the information at first received it had appeared that All Saints' was the chief available school for the children turned out of the High Pavement School. There was no doubt there were vacant places in All Saints' school, the use of which would necessitate the children crossing this open space, but there were abundant vacant places in three other Board schools, which were nearer the homes of the children, than would have been available if the use of the gymnasium and the laundry were continued. These vacant places numbered 242, and he thought that that set at rest any question that the children attending Board schools would be driven to a denominational school. Until the Board of Education were satisfied that a higher elementary school could be conducted under the conditions on which alone a higher elementary school must be conducted under the law, they must decline to sanction the use of the temporary building. As to finance, the Board of Education had made the best arrangement in their power to meet the convenience of the local authorities out of the sums voted by Parliament for the present year—the Parliamentary Grant, the Block Grant, the Aid Grant, and the Fee Grant—and they could do no more. It was said that it was wrong to refer the local authorities to the Local Government Board or to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but it was to them that they must go, because the Board of Education had done all it could do, and could not get more than twelve pence out of the shilling. He now turned to the staple of the debate. He was glad that the hon. Member for Camberwell, who opened the discussion, had been good enough to express his satisfaction with the clause in the new Code as to the non-employment of the elementary school teachers in other work than in the elementary schools. The hon. Member had remarked that, although the Code had been altered to some extent, he regretted that it had not been made effective in some other of its provisions. That he also regretted; but it must be borne in mind that it would have been very rash to revise the Code further in view of the new conditions, which were hardly yet realised, and while the Board of Education were working under very great pressure. They did attempt to revise the Code, but it was found that it would be better to leave things as they were for a while than to attempt the larger revision certainly called for, and to make only such arrangements as appeared to be urgent, rather than cause temporary confusion without really producing what must take time to produce—a consecutive and well-ordered Code. He came now to the subject of the new course of physical drill which had been so keenly criticised on both sides of the House. He had been somewhat surprised at the objection which came from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, because in the Code of last year this model course of physical training was set forth, not as absolutely compulsory, but as definitely a "Model Course" setting forth the minimum of what was desirable even in small schools. Almost the first important document which came into his hands during the first two days of his term of office was this much-criticised "Model Course," which he had received with veneration as the right hon. Gentleman's last completed work at the Board of Education. However, if the Code of 1902 were compared with that of 1903 it would be found that a very great change had taken place as to the mode in which the physical training was to be dealt with. The "Model Course" was regarded as suitable to the upper classes of elementary schools. What was now mainly set forth was that physical training should be looked upon as one of the most important parts of elementary education. The object in view was the healthy development and training of muscles, and not merely smartness and dexterity in the performance of drill. Somewhat severe criticisms had been levelled against the "Model Course," and one hon. Member had said that the Board of Education seemed determined to make the children soldiers, and the parents pro-Boers. It was also said that some of the requirements of the "Model Course" were grotesque and injurious to the health, but to judge from the pictures illustrating the Swedish drill, that was nearly as grotesque as the exercises prescribed by the "Model Course," and in each case the exercises were noted as optional. However, the Board of Education had become perfectly aware of the difficulties attending the carrying out of this "Model Course." They had discovered that the local conditions and circumstances of the schools, and the space available for the exercises, made it impossible in some places to carry out the "Model Course." It was very difficult to be learned by the teachers, especially by female teachers, while certain of the requirements could not apply to children of tender age or to girls. The main purpose of the Board was the physical education of the children, and he attached the importance given to it by hon. Members on both sides of the House. He entirely agreed with the hon. Member for Hereford, who had put the subject in the most forcible and impressive form. Nevertheless, he thought the "Model Course" had been somewhat hardly dealt with, because under proper conditions, and as a guide, it had produced excellent results. The President of the Board of Education, who took a great interest in the subject, went only that day to see a large school exercised in physical training, and had reported that the drill was very well done, and that there was nothing of a special military character about it, while it was seemingly producing excellent results. But the Scottish Educational Department had recently been inquiring into the subject of physical training, and the results of that inquiry would receive the closest attention. If it were necessary, and he thought it would be, the Board of Education would be prepared to appoint a Departmental Committee to inquire into the best form of physical training for children.

MR. BRYCE: Will it deal with the question of physical training generally, and not confine itself to the particular objection now raised?

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said its investigations would not be confined solely to the model course.

As to inspection, the Board would be glad to place the results of the work of their inspectors at the disposal of the local authorities. It was desirable that there should be co-operation in the matter; but the Board had some hesitation in suggesting that the local authorities were not capable of doing the work of inspection for themselves. As to the same inspectors undertaking the inspection of both elementary and secondary schools, the whole future of inspection was uncertain. A new set of conditions was being entered upon, and the demand for the inspection of secondary schools would be greatly increased by the requirements of the registry of teachers. Teachers would have to undergo a certain training and a period of probation. This would involve an addition to the inspectorate of secondary schools, and he hoped that as time went on they might be able to develop a complete system of inspection of secondary schools, and that it might be possible for their inspectors to interchange their work, and in that way the Board would get a better and more comprehensive knowledge of the whole educational system of the country than they could secure if their inspectors worked on two separate and distinct lines. But he said this with reservations. He did not feel that it was possible at this moment to forecast the results of the Education Act of last year and of the work which was being done in framing a register of teachers, and he could only express the hope that they would get a fuller and better system of inspection of all classes of schools in the not remote future than they had had in the past.

The right hon. Member for Somerset had suggested that the Board of Education might do something more to assist local authorities in telling them what they had to do in the way of secondary education. There again the Board of Education had rather shrunk from any appearance of a desire to dictate to the local education authorities. He suggested that they should send round consulting inspectors, who would tell the local education authorities the best lines on which they could conduct their secondary education work. He thought he would prefer to wait until they had received some invitation from the local authorities.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE: Under the Act the local authorities are bound to act in consultation with the Board of Education.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that was so, and when they entered into consultation with the Board of Education, they would probably say in what way they expected the Board to assist them in developing their schools for secondary education. When they did that he need not say that the Board of Education would be most happy to do all they could to help them in their work. The next matter which had been discussed was the attitude of the Board of Education to the schemes submitted by the Councils; and some suggestions had been made as to the Board using such powers as it possessed to put undue pressure upon Councils. The object of the Board, first and last, had been to assist the County Councils in the work of forming their schemes; and to do this they sent round, in the first instance, a memorandum which told them what their powers were, what were the resources at their disposal, and the mode in which the Act empowered them to construct their committee. They confined themselves almost entirely to the provisions of the Act last session. But they did do something to explain—and this was what the right hon. Gentleman opposite objected to—what was meant by "nomination" and "recommendation," and what were the duties of the Board of Education in respect to schemes. He believed that, on the whole, the well-intentioned suggestions which had been put forward had worked well. The Board had made them frequently, and without causing offence. He thought the hon. Gentleman, the Member for Leicester, who had taxed him with some malpractices in regard to the Leicester and Loughborough schemes, could hardly have understood the process by which these schemes were made. There was a great deal of informal communication between the persons interested. When the Board received the scheme they possibly sent it back with some suggestions. But those were merely suggestions. All the Board could do was to withhold its approval of the scheme, in which event it must make a scheme of its own at the end of the year, and get it put into operation by provisional order. Was it conceivable that the Board of Education should wish to adopt any course of that sort? The fact was that, so far as his experience went, the Board of Education and the local authorities had been working together in the most friendly spirit. The Board's suggestions had been taken in good part, and if they had not been accepted, the Board had taken that non-acceptance in very good part. On the whole, he believed that an excellent body of schemes would shortly be brought into operation. They would be creditable to the local authorities which promoted them, and of advantage to the areas in which they were to operate. The Board of Education had really been single-minded in this matter. There had been no thought of forcing the representation either of intellectual interests or of denominational interests on any council with which the Board had had to do. The desire had been that the council might avoid the risk of remonstrance, appeal, and delay in the operation of the scheme. As to the noble Lord's suggestion that there were still secondary schools which had been founded for profit, and which also obtained grants from the Board of Education, he must say that he knew of no such schools. If there were any he was ready to inquire into the matter, and he thought he could assure the Committee that none of the money now asked for would go in that direction. As regarded physical training, he hoped the Departmental Committee, which it was proposed to constitute, would be able to produce a thoroughly acceptable scheme. As to inspection, he hoped that in a short time a good system would be worked out.

Dr. MACNAMARA said he would like to express his sense of obligation to the hon. Gentleman for having decided to appoint an expert Committee to inquire into the question of physical training. Under the circumstances he asked leave to withdraw his Motion.

Motion by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said he desired to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he would be good enough to reconsider the regulation preventing the giving of information with regard to the number of marks obtained by candidates who failed to obtain a place in the second class in the King's Scholarship Examinations. He ventured to think that where the friends of pupil teachers were sufficiently interested in the result of an examination to apply to the Board of Education, they should be told in what particular subject the student had not done well, so that he might either give particular attention to it before the next examination, or cease his efforts to enter a profession for which he was eminently unqualified.

MR. LAYLAND BARRATT (Devonshire, Torquay) feared there might be some misapprehension owing to the form in which a certain circular had been issued by the Board of Education when a scheme was before the Cornwall County Council. He moved an Amendment to the third clause, suggesting the substitution of the words, "schools not provided by the council" for "voluntary elementary schools." The Clerk at once said he had received a letter from the Board of Education intimating that they intended to use the words, "voluntary elementary schools" in these cases, and that if the Amendment were adopted, the Board would probably send the scheme back. Now he wanted to know if the Board of Education had any objection to the use of the words he had suggested.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON promised the hon. Member for Lancaster to further inquire into the question of giving information to the friends of unsuccessful students in the King's Scholarship Examinations. In regard to the use of the words "non-provided schools," the Board, after consideration of the point, decided in favour of the old-fashioned phraseology, merely substituting "council" for "Board" schools, but if any Council preferred the words "non-provided" he did not think there would be any objection to using them; it was merely a matter of taste.

MR. LAYLAND-BARRATT: Was the clerk to the Cornwall County Council right in construing the circular of the Board of Education as an intimation that any scheme containing the words he suggested would not be sanctioned?

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: I think if my hon. friend looks at the document he will see it merely contains a number of suggestions; there is nothing to indicate that the Board of Education would necessarily refuse to approve or even to remonstrate against the non-adoption of any of them.

*MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) said he wished to move the reduction of the Vote by £100 in order to call attention to the action of the Scottish Education Department. The Committee had heard a good deal about the importance of inspection. They had inspectors in Scotland who made reports to the Scottish Education Department with reference to bad ventilation, bad drainage of schools, and bad supplies of water; and his complaint was that those reports were disregarded by the Department. As a result of the insanitary condition of some of the schools, and the bad water supply, fevers broke out in the country districts, more especially in the Highlands and Islands, which were far removed from populous towns. Then the schools in the district were closed. One school in the Island of Lewis, which had been attended by 200 children, had been closed for many months owing to fever; whereas, if the Scottish Education Department had attended to the reports of the inspectors, the disease might have been prevented. It was the duty of the Education Department to urge on the Local Government Board the necessity of taking action in order to get rid of disease as far as possible. Fever was raging in the district he referred to in Lewis for months. The Education Department did not move in the matter. No inquiry was held. Such a state of things could not happen in England, and he wanted the Education Department to realise that it was a very serious matter that a school should be closed for months. That was not an isolated case. Such cases were continually happening in outlying districts, and no one took the trouble to inquire into them except the school inspector. He gave a good and honest report, but that report was disregarded by the Education Department. That was not fair to the children or to the parents. It was not patriotic that High and children should be left without education. What chance had they without education? There were no industries in these parts, and it was essential that the boys and girls in the Highlands should have the benefit of the best possible education to equip them for life in any part of the world. At present they did not get a chance. Another matter to which he wished to refer was the custom of carrying peats to school every morning. He thought that was abolished, and that a circular had been issued that it was quite irregular. He should like to know whether any steps had been taken to stop it in every part of the Highlands. The Report of the Royal Commission on Physical Training had just been issued, and he hoped that in every school in Scotland physical training, not military training, would be given to the boys and girls. He hoped the Lord Advocate would give him information on the points he had raised.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire) said the hon. Member had indulged in the denunciation of the Education Department, but he had evidently not been able to differentiate between a school inspector and an inspector of the Local Government Board. As far as the school inspectors were concerned, he could only say there was not the slightest cause whatever for imputing to them neglect.

*MR. WEIR said he did not charge the school inspectors with neglect; he charged the Scotch Education Office. He said distinctly that the school inspectors did their duty well; but when they complained in their reports, no attention was paid to them by the Education Department.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said that the hon. Member never seemed to realise the difference between the Education Department and those who were entrusted with the public health. There was no reason, whatever, for charging the Scotch Education Department with any neglect of duty in this matter. The defects which were brought to their knowledge were immediately brought to the knowledge of the local bodies. The hon. Member had never been able to clear his mind as to the real duties and powers of the Central Education Department. It was not a public health Department, and never would be; and until the hon. Member got into his mind a clearer view of the functions of the Department, he supposed they would hear his vague denunciations from year to year. He could not tell the hon. Gentleman any more about peats. As the hon. Gentleman knew, a circular stopping the practice of bringing peats to school was issued; and, so far as he knew, there had been no contravention of that circular. But if there was, it should be brought before the notice of the department, in order that they might communicate with the School Board authorities. The hon. Member entirely forgot that in all those matters it was the School Board that was responsible, and not the Education Department, who could not tell whether a certain number of girls in the Highlands were carrying peats in their pinafores or not.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) said he desired to ask the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Agriculture a question with regard to a speech he delivered at Leicester. According to the report of that speech which appeared in *The Times*, the right hon. Gentleman said that the Board of Agriculture in the past had relied too much on the advice of agricultural bodies, such as the Central Chamber of Agriculture; and that it was his intention to substitute for such advice an advisory board, to be set up and appointed by himself. The right hon. Gentleman did not go into details, and, so far, no statement had been published as to how this board was to be constituted. Was it to be a paid body or an unpaid body? Was it to be appointed by the right hon. Gentleman, or by societies such as the Royal Agricultural Society, and similar societies? He would ask the right hon. Gentleman before he called this board into existence to consider a rather serious question. If it was to be set up by himself, it would remain for all time undoubtedly. There was this danger: that the President of the Board of Trade might take a line unpopular with agriculturists; and he would then be able to fall back on this board, and say that it was no use farmers' clubs or the Central Chamber of Agriculture taking a different view. He thought it was very necessary before the body was called into existence that further information should be given, and that the matter should be fully discussed in the House.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston) said he would explain very briefly what the facts were. He thought the hon. Baronet had rather misunderstood what he said at Leicester, because the body which he proposed to appoint was a totally different body to that which the hon. Baronet appeared to imagine. He did not want to supersede the advice of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, which he thought most valuable. His difficulty was that such bodies only represented the general wants of farmers as a whole; and he was most anxious to get in touch with farmers in various districts, and with the various industries they represented. Farming in one district might differ very much from farming in another district; and he, therefore, wanted to get into touch with all the various localities. He did not want one body advising him as to farming in general, but as the industry varied in the various localities, he wanted to be advised from each locality; to have people with whom he could put himself in touch, and learn the real pressing needs of the people. He proposed to appoint some fifteen advisers, a clear majority of whom would be appointed by the agricultural associations; and in order that all classes of farmers might be represented he proposed to retain the nomination of something under one-half in his own hands; because he knew that very often the associations did not represent the smaller men, and he was most anxious that they should be represented.

MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock) said they all had a great deal of confidence in the present President of the Board of Agriculture. He had shown great anxiety to be well acquainted with the needs of the agricultural districts, and had inspired confidence; and he ventured to express the hope that Parliament would support his efforts to deal properly with the important industry of agriculture by providing him with the wherewithal. They had two striking cases recently of the decadence of agriculture. One was the anxiety with reference to the native food supply in time of war; the other was the inferiority of recruits for the Army. He thought both these questions had arisen, in no small degree, because of the difficulties agriculturists encountered in recent years. They, however, looked with hope to the energy and ability with which the right hon. Gentleman was presiding over the Board of Agriculture. He was entirely in accord with the right hon. Gentleman's proposal to form an advisory committee. He thought it was of the greatest importance that agriculturists should be in close touch with the President of the Board of Agriculture; and that they should be able to bring to his attention matters which would promote agriculture, and prevent the depopulation of the rural districts. He should like to point out some of the means to that end. They looked to the President of the Board of Agriculture to help them with reference to railway rates. Certainly, the British farmer had a good deal to complain of in the treatment he received from the railway companies. He thought it should be easy for the Board of Agriculture to make arrangements with the railway companies to provide, at least one day a week, trucks to carry farm produce in small quantities, at a lower rate than now obtained. Another matter was the desirability of promoting some uniform system of weights and measures. Agriculturists were being continually handicapped by the different standards, which caused inconvenience and confusion, and he thought also, loss. Another matter was the establishment of a system of parcels post for farm produce.

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman proceeded, in pursuance of Standing Order 15, to put the Question necessary to dispose of the Vote.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

1. Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the years ending on the 31st day of March, 1902 and 1903, the sum of £1,520,704 15s. 5d. be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

2. Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904, the sum of £38,997,200 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

Adjourned at six minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 20th March, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Maryport Harbour Bill [H.L.], Committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Nantwich Urban District Council Bill [H.L.], Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table: The orders made on the 9th and 12th instant discharged; and Bill committed for Tuesday next.

PETITIONS.

Shops (Early Closing) Bill [H.L.], Petition in favour of; of Glasgow Corporation; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CROFTER HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACTS, 1886-87.

Report by the Crofters Commission, being for the year ended 31st December, 1902: Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (WEST RIDING OF THE COUNTY OF YORK).

Order made by the County Council of the West Riding of the County of York, altering certain polling districts in the Shipley, Sowerby, Holmfirth, and Morley Parliamentary Divisions.

PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1881 (ORDERS).

Two Orders in Council, dated 16th March, 1903, with respect to the importation of arms and ammunition, for the purpose of adding Arklow to the ports at which explosives may be landed.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act) and ordered to lie on the Table.

SHOPS (EARLY CLOSING) BILL [H.L.].

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

Moved, that the House do now resolve itself into Committee on this Bill.—(*Lord Avebury.*)

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: My Lords, before your Lordships go into Committee on this Bill, I should like to say a word, not by way of opposing the Motion which Lord Avebury has just moved, but simply to state that the matter of procedure which will be dealt with in Committee appears to me to be a very secondary matter compared with the great principles which are involved in this Bill. The other night when Lord Ribblesdale, who was first in the field, had his Bill down for Second Reading, I placed a notice on the Paper to move that the Bill be read a second time that day six months; but, on that Bill being shunted, through the action of the Lord Chancellor, in favour of Lord Avebury's measure, it appeared to me, owing to the wrangle that took place, that the best course, for those who object to the Bill on principle, to adopt would be to fight the question on the Third Reading. That is what I propose to do. I propose to move on the Third Reading stage a Resolution setting forth my views, and the views of those who agree with me, against this kind of legislation, and in the meantime I can only hope that those who favour this thoroughly un-English legislation will succeed, in Committee, in making the Bill, which limits for the first time the labour of adult persons in this country, more restrictive of trade and a greater interference with freedom of contract. I shall take no part in the discussion.

There is, however, "a third Richmond in the field" in the shape of a Bill prepared by Lord Arran, which, in my judgment, if you are going in for this sort of legislation, is a far better Bill than either Lord Ribblesdale's or Lord Avebury's, because "it goes the whole hog." It prescribes the hours for meals, the time that should be given for dinner and for tea, and there is not a Clause—and there are a good many clauses in the Bill—which has not appended at the end of it a £5 penalty. That is the most perfect measure of the three, and I would suggest to your Lordships the adoption of that Bill as the foundation of your legislation. There is only one thing wanting in it. I would humbly suggest that a clause should be introduced compelling shop girls at certain times of the day to sit upon the seats provided by the Bill of last year, which, I am told, they now positively refuse to do. As the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack has gone in for this kind of legislation I would suggest to him, in view of the importance of Lord Arran's Bill, that he should follow the precedent he established the other day and move that this debate be now adjourned with a view to the House considering Lord Arran's Bill.

EARL COWPER: My Lords, I desire to say a few words upon this Bill before we go into Committee. The debate the other day on the Second Reading was of a peculiar and unsatisfactory nature, the discussion being very much interrupted by some question of procedure which rather diverted your Lordships' attention from the main subject. Besides that, we had come down to consider a Bill the debate on which, after the speech of the mover, was adjourned, and the substitution of the Bill standing in the name of Lord Avebury rather interfered with the discussion. I confess I do not think I could quite have brought myself to vote against the Second Reading, because I am willing to believe that at the present time great hardships are inflicted on shop assistants. The mere statement that they have to work fourteen hours a day continuously, is enough to move our pity. But we must, of course, remember that this is a workman's question on both sides—that the working men and women who use these shops are at work all day, and can only do their shopping in the evening; and it is very difficult to find out how far they will be injured and how far they will not. We have gone too far in our legislation to lay it down as a general rule that we ought never to interfere with freedom of contract; nevertheless, I think it ought to be very carefully looked into, and there ought to be no legislative interference unless it is proved to be absolutely necessary. I was in hopes that the unpretending little Bill which was introduced by that clear-headed philanthropist the late Duke of Westminster, on, I think, almost the last occasion on which he appeared in this House, and was successfully passed into law—namely, the Bill making it necessary that seats should be provided in shops—would to a certain degree have relieved the hardships complained of, particularly among women, who are supposed by doctors to be particularly affected by long hours; but whether it has done so or not, I do not know. I am willing to believe that there is a great deal of suffering in these cases, although very little was said upon that by the advocates of these measures when the Second Reading was moved. One is rather afraid, particularly in this House, of making sensational speeches, or of appearing to be sentimental in any way, and that was, perhaps, the reason why the movers of the two Bills contented themselves with referring to Reports of Committees, or to Proceedings in the other House; but I think it is too much to expect of an ordinary Member of your Lordships' House that he should have read the Reports of every Committee during the past few years, or that he should read all the speeches that are made in another place.

I admit that there is a grievance, and that if it can be remedied it should be. I pass to the particular measures proposed in this Bill, which I think require a little more discussion than they have received. There is, in the first place, the question of local option, of allowing these things to be settled by local authorities. I am well aware of the advisability of local authorities being given more to do, and I am in favour of devolution and decentralisation; of relieving as much as possible the overworked central offices such as the Local Government Board, the Home Office, and the Board of Education; but that is altogether a different question. If a thing can be settled by a general statute there is great advantage over its being settled locally. The difficulty of local action is the want of uniformity which must ensue. County Councils and Borough Councils are generally influenced, like even greater assemblies, by two or three leading men, and it may happen that in one district these men may have old-fashioned ideas, and, like the noble Earl on the Cross Benches, be opposed to all interference, whilst in others they may take a more generous view. This, of course, will cause difference of action in different places. However large a district may be, it must have a boundary, and there must, therefore, be cases in which on one side of the boundary the shops will be shut, while those across the street will be left open. In these cases, of course, the trade will naturally go from the shops which are obliged to close to those which are kept open, and the wretched assistants in the latter shops will see their more happy fellows on the other side of the street go home at seven or eight o'clock, while they have to remain till a much later hour. Not only will there be want of uniformity in these places. I see that in the Bill there is a provision for a classification of shops. Therefore, shops of one class may succeed in getting a majority of two-thirds of their owners to petition in favour of closing, and another class of shops, not really very different, may fail to get this majority. It is, I believe, a rule that a hardship, however great it may be, is better borne and gives less cause of discontent if it is general than if it is partial, and if certain shops, by chance perhaps, or by caprice, are exempted, the others will suffer much more.

I may be told that the reason we are proceeding by districts is that circumstances differ in different places, but I am not quite sure that that is always the case. Shops which are frequented by well-to-do people and the bulk of the middle classes do not, of course, do any considerable trade at night, and it would be no hardship if they were closed; but there are poor men's shops in almost every district, and in those shops there are the two conflicting interests I have mentioned—the interests of the shop assistants and of the customers. I think everything points to the advisability, if possible, of having a general measure which will meet each case instead of proceeding by the principle of local option. Then comes the question as to what form this general Bill should take. So far as I can judge, the grievance is that these people are kept at work for an enormous length of time daily. What is wanted, then, is not an Early Closing Bill, for we do not care how long shops are kept open so long as the assistants are not overworked. It seems to me that when the trade is a night trade the shopkeeper might very reasonably be allowed to open his shop in the middle of the day and keep it open till late in the evening. No harm whatever would be done in such a case, provided the assistants did not start work till the middle of the day. Or if the shopkeeper wished to catch the early morning trade, he could do so and close his shop in the middle of the day until the evening. So far as recreation is concerned, I think it is well known that one hour in the open air when the sun is shining does one more good than several hours in a close room after dark, or in the open streets. What is wanted is not a Shops Closing Bill, but a Shops Hours Bill. I think that will be found to be the only true remedy. This, however, opens up too large a question for me to enter into now, but what I say is—and I think many of your Lordships will be of my opinion—that the Bill is built upon wrong lines and that a general measure would be far preferable.

*LORD AVEBURY: My Lords, I can hardly imagine that my noble friend on the Cross Benches (the Earl of Wemyss) intended his remarks to be taken seriously. There are, however, one or two of his statements to which I must respectfully demur. The noble Earl said that Lord Ribblesdale's Bill was first in the field. As a matter of fact, the Early Closing Bill standing in my name has been a long time in the field. It has been twice read a second time without a division in the House of Commons, and it was before two Committees of that House prior to its coming before your Lordships. The noble Earl spoke of "Lord Ribbledale's Bill" and "Lord Avebury's Bill." I submit that the Bill now before your Lordships is not my Bill. It is, in the first place, the Bill of the shopkeepers. It was drafted at two Congresses of Shopkeepers and is supported by practically the whole of the Shopkeepers' Associations all over the country. Your Lordships referred the subject to a Committee, and it was in consequence of the unanimous Report of that Committee, and with the support of the whole of the members of the Committee, that this Bill was introduced. Surely, when a question is referred to a Committee for consideration, and that Committee arrives at a unanimous conclusion, it is only natural and reasonable that a Bill based upon that Report and supported by your Committee should be considered.

Now I come to the remarks which fell from the noble Earl who has just sat down. I think he can hardly have been present at the Second Reading, because I then went, as also did Lord Ribblesdale, at some length into the hardships which induced both he and I to submit Bills for your Lordships' consideration. My noble friend demurred to local authorities having these powers, but under our Bill the local authorities are not the initiating bodies; they only have power to carry out the wishes of the shopkeepers themselves. My noble friend is very anxious to have uniformity of treatment, but the members of the Committee will agree with me when I say that the shopkeepers impressed upon us very strongly indeed that the needs of districts varied considerably, and that there was a general consensus of opinion amongst the shopkeeping community that you could not have the same hours in all trades and for all places. Therefore they all advocated the elasticity which is in this Bill. Then the noble Earl spoke of the conflicting interests of employers and employed. To their honour be it said, there is not, and never has been, any conflict between employers and employed as regards this movement. The shopkeepers themselves are most anxious for this Bill, and there is no conflict whatever between them and their employees. Then the noble Lord said he would favour a Bill which dealt with men and not with shops, but the evidence placed before us was that the small shopkeepers themselves were most anxious to have the small shops closed; otherwise, the men who kept open the latest would do the late trade. We were convinced that no measure which dealt with the hours of assistants and not with shops would meet the wishes of the shopkeeping community. Lastly, the noble Earl spoke of the interests of working men and women. We had before us in the Committee the representatives of the great trade unions of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and they told us that their members were strongly of opinion that some measure of this kind was most urgently required, and that they were satisfied that it would in no way conflict with the interests of working men and women.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: When I said Lord Ribblesdale was first in the field I referred to this session. I quite admit that he was poaching on the ground of Lord Avebury.

On Question, agreed to; House in Committee (according to order).

Clause 1:—

LORD RIBBLESDALE moved to amend the clause by leaving out the words requiring the local authority to satisfy itself that at least two-thirds of the occupiers of the shops affected approve the application. He confessed that the course of procedure that evening, and the observations that had fallen from noble Lords rather inclined him to make a Second Reading speech, but having already spoken in moving his measure, and having listened to two Second Reading speeches from the noble Lord in charge of the Bill now before their Lordships, he would refrain from doing so. As to being first in the field, he wished to retire from that position altogether. He never pretended to have been first in the field. He happened to be first on the Order Paper, and that was the whole point on which the controversy turned. He rather agreed with what the noble Earl on the Cross Benches said, that as regards the particular question of the earlier closing of shops, Lord Arran's Bill seemed to be the most practical.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of MORLEY): I would remind the noble Lord that the House is in Committee, and that he is moving an Amendment to Clause 1.

LORD RIBBLESDALE, referring to Lord Avebury's statement that the Bill was a Shopkeepers' Bill, said that was the very reason why he moved his Amendment. It was quite clear that without the two-thirds majority of the shopkeepers the Bill would become waste paper. The shopkeepers were not merely to agree to this legislation; they were to initiate it; and to leave it to the shopkeepers would simply be to rely on that voluntary effort which had always proved quite ineffective. It seemed to him that the arrangements made by the noble Lord presented some ethical and some practical difficulties. The proposal was like that of two-thirds of the forces in a hunting country being empowered to legislate in favour of the poultry and the game; he did not think anything would be done. The shopkeepers, Lord Avebury said, were warm supporters of the Bill, and in his memorandum attached to the Bill, the noble Lord stated that as regarded London a petition in its favour had been signed by about half the shopkeepers affected. They all knew the great attention which the noble Lord and others had given to this matter, and probably that petition had been very carefully put in motion, and all the parties thoroughly canvassed. If, therefore, only half the shopkeepers had signed the petition it was fair to assume that the two-thirds majority would not be forthcoming, and that nothing would be done if the words he proposed to omit were allowed to remain in the Bill. It might be said that they should not force regulations of this sort on shopkeepers if they were unwilling to have them; but his answer was that they would never have seen the Factory Acts passed if they had waited for an expression of opinion from the manufacturers, or for them to take the initiative.

As to his own Bill, he would take this opportunity of laying it to rest. He had said with absolute sincerity the other night that if he could not get his own Bill, he would do his best to further the passing of the present Bill. The point he was coming to when he was interrupted, quite properly, by the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees was that, although he preferred Lord Arran's Bill in many ways, having made this statement the other day he would loyally stick to Lord Avebury's. He quite admitted that the draft order and the placing of it on the Table of the House was better than the cumbersome provisional order and Act of Parliament which he prescribed in his Bill; but he would submit to the noble Lord that the clause would be greatly improved if the words he proposed to leave out were omitted. The section would then read—

> "If an application be made to the council of any county or borough, praying them to make a draft order for the closing throughout the county or borough or any specified part thereof of any class or classes of shops on such days and at such hours as may be specified in the application, then the council shall give public notice of the receipt of such application and of the period within which objections may be made thereto."

He would rather leave it to the local authority, which was conversant with the needs of the community, than to the shopkeepers themselves to initiate this legislation. He submitted that by accepting the Amendment the House would be carrying out, both in the spirit and in the letter, the Report of the Select Committee of 1901, and the recommendation moved by Lord Salisbury, which ran to this effect—

> "That they recommended unanimously that Town Councils should be authorised to pass provisional orders making such regulations in respect to the closing of shops as might seem to them to be necessary for the areas under their jurisdiction."

Amendment moved.

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 9, to leave out from 'application' to 'them' in line 11."—(*Lord Ribblesdale.*)

*LORD AVEBURY said that as the Bill originally stood it contained two safeguards. In the first place, two-thirds of the shopkeepers had to take the initiative; and, in the second place, they had to convince the local authority that their proposal was a reasonable and proper one. At the suggestion of Lord Salisbury two further safeguards were introduced by which the local authority had to apply to the central authority—in this case the Home Office—and the Home Office had to lay the order before Parliament. In the circumstances he thought they might safely reduce the number of shopkeepers who were to approve the application from two-thirds to one-half. But if the Amendment were accepted, it would be in the power of a single shopkeeper to present an application to the local authority and put the locality to the great expense of an inquiry, though it might turn out that only a handful of shopkeepers were in favour of the early closing. When it had been alleged that the Bill might press hardly on small shopkeepers, the answer they had always been able to give, was that nothing could be done unless a large majority of the shopkeepers were themselves in favour of it. That had always satisfied the shopkeepers. As the Bill stood the overwhelming body of the shopkeepers were in favour of it; but he doubted whether they would still support it, if it provided that shops might be closed against their wishes. He was willing, however, and indeed should be glad to reduce the number of shopkeepers who were to approve the application from two-thirds to one-half.

LORD MONKSWELL said it seemed to him that the noble Lord had entirely misapprehended the objection which Lord Ribblesdale had taken to the clause as it stood. The noble Lord in charge of the Bill expressly stated in the Memorandum that there were three classes principally affected—the customers, the assistants, and the shopkeepers; and, that being the case, it appeared to him singularly unjust and illogical that the shopkeepers, whether by a majority or by one-half, should have the initiation of this matter entirely in their own hands. Apparently the local authority would be bound by the opinion of the shopkeepers even if they found, on investigation, that the customers were dead against it and that the shop assistants would prefer that the regulations were not enforced. He had had the opportunity that afternoon of discussing the two Bills in a Committee of the London County Council, and the Committee unanimously came to the conclusion that it was extremely desirable that all three classes should be consulted in the matter, and that the local authority, having held an investigation, should proceed on the evidence before them as to the wishes of the customers, the assistants, and the shopkeepers, and should not be bound to accept the view of one class only. With regard to Lord Avebury's objection that if the Amendment were adopted it would be in the power of a single shopkeeper to present an application and put the locality to the expense of an inquiry, he did not see why the local authority should not be empowered to move in the matter at their own option. They would have regard to the state of public feeling in the locality, and would not go to the expense of holding an inquiry unless they had reason to believe that it was desired.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH inquired in what way the local authorities were to satisfy themselves that one-half or two-thirds of the shopkeepers were in favour of earlier closing. He preferred the Amendment moved by Lord Ribblesdale; but, if it was the general feeling that the shopkeepers should be consulted, he would support the reduction of the number who were to approve the application from two-thirds to one-half.

LORD DAVEY confessed that he saw the same difficulty as the noble Earl who had just sat down. The Bill contained no provision as to the means by which the local authorities were to ascertain what proportion the number of shopkeepers who desired earlier closing bore to the rest of the shopkeepers. How were they to ascertain whether the proportion was two-thirds, or one-half, or one-third? Was it proposed that a poll of the shopkeepers should be taken? In any case, a large expense would be incurred. He thought the provision as to the assent of two-thirds of the shopkeepers ought to be omitted. The members of the local authority, being the representatives of the shopkeepers, might very well decide the matter themselves. He had great apprehension, if the clause remained in its present form, that in London, and in large towns like Manchester, the Bill would be found to be unworkable, because it would be extremely difficult for the local authorities, if anyone outside challenged their decision, to show that the estimate they had formed was a correct estimate. For that reason he supported the Amendment.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (the Earl of HALSBURY) pointed out that there was no poll of the shopkeepers to be taken. All the clause provided was that the local authority should be satisfied in their own minds that two-thirds of the shopkeepers were in favour of early closing. If they were so satisfied, no one could challenge their decision.

THE LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER said that the class injured most by the late hours of shops were the assistants, and, therefore, some attention should be paid to their wishes. The Bill which the shop assistants would no doubt have preferred had had to give place to the present Bill. The question of early closing concerned the shop assistants more closely than the shopkeepers, and there would, therefore, appear to be a certain amount of injustice in making special provision for the consent of the class least interested, and no provision for the consent of the assistants. Looking to the safeguards which Lord Avebury had himself recounted, there was very little chance of the interests and the opinions of the shopkeepers being overlooked. He thought that in fairness to all the classes affected by the Bill the Amendment ought to be accepted.

*LORD AVEBURY quite agreed that local authorities might, with advantage, be empowered to move in the matter at their own option, but he pointed out that the technical result of passing the Amendment would be that they would have to take into consideration any memorial they might receive, even if it only contained one signature. He did not think the locality should be put to the expense of holding an inquiry in the case of such a memorial. With regard to the objection of his noble and learned friend Lord Davey, the evidence given before the Committee was to the effect that the witnesses had no doubt whatever that they would be able to satisfy their own local authorities that two-thirds of the shopkeepers were in favour of earlier closing. The most difficult case was that of London, where there were some 29,000 shops. He presented a petition to the House of Commons a few years ago in favour of this Bill, signed by over 13,000 London shopkeepers, which he thought was a very strong indication, particularly as that was merely a petition got up by persons who felt a general interest in the question, that if the Bill passed, there would be no difficulty in satisfying the London County Council that two-thirds of the shopkeepers of London did desire earlier closing. The right rev. Prelate had stated that the shop assistants had not been sufficiently considered, and that they would prefer a different Bill. He believed that the shop assistants would prefer this Bill to any other possible measure. The witnesses before the Committee admitted that they could not expect in London to get earlier closing than 8.30 or 9 o'clock p.m. That would be of no use to many towns, where the shops now closed earlier. The general feeling of the assistants was, that if this Bill passed, they would immediately get a general reduction of their hours, and that the elasticity of the Bill would enable them, if that were found to work well, to close at a still earlier hour, whereas, if the hour was fixed, it would have to be such an hour as would confer no advantage on any town except London. The Association of Grocers' Assistants are strongly in favour of the Bill, as also were the Scottish Associations, which combined both shopkeepers and assistants. Indeed, he could safely say that assistants generally were anxious that the Bill should become law.

LORD BELPER, on behalf of the Government, approved the attitude of the noble Lord in resisting the Amendment, and said it was these safeguards which specially recommended the Bill to the acceptance of the Government and the House. There was no great difficulty about the procedure. It was necessary, in the first place, for the local authority, on the receipt of the application, to be satisfied in their own minds that two-thirds of the shopkeepers were in favour of earlier closing. The council then gave public notice of the receipt of the application and of the period within which objections might be made to it; and, after due consideration of any objections received, and of the area and classes affected by the application, they might submit to the central authority a draft order for earlier closing. This draft order would be still more fully considered by the central authority, who would have additional opportunity of inquiry, and to whose order Parliament could object if it wished. It would very much destroy the safeguard in the Bill if the Amendment were adopted.

*EARL SPENCER, referring to the alternative Bills and proposals before the House, said he was most in favour of the plan of the noble Lord opposite (the Earl of Lytton), who would leave the decision entirely to the local authority without requiring them to apply for a provisional order. Next to that he preferred the Amendment of Lord Ribblesdale. It was exceedingly cumbrous to have to go through all the procedure referred to, and he strongly appealed to His Majesty's Government, if they could not accept the Amendment standing in the name of Lord Lytton, to consider whether they could not accept the proposal of his noble friend behind him. The Bill went a great deal further than the recommendation of the noble Marquess the late Prime Minister with regard to provisional orders. He hoped the Government would reconsider the point, and accept the simple plan of the noble Earl opposite or that of his noble friend Lord Ribblesdale.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY understood the opposition to the Amendment to be in harmony with the report of the Select Committee, who were in favour of a two-thirds majority. One of the surprises in the history of this Bill was the change of view regarding the initiative of the shopkeepers, which was originally represented as a necessary safeguard. Whichever view was right in the abstract, he thought the practical course was to advance on the lines already approved, and which had just been supported by the noble Lord representing the Home Office.

LORD BURGHCLERE would rather have this Bill than no Bill at all; but he wished to know whether it would be absolutely necessary that there should be a two-thirds majority of the shopkeepers in order to set the local authority in motion, and whether, if the local authority were satisfied that a two-thirds majority were in favour of earlier closing, their decision might afterwards be questioned.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said the only thing the Bill required was that the local authority should themselves be satisfied. If they were, no legal objection whatever could be taken on the ground that some one else was satisfied that there was not a two-thirds majority. Provision for the expenses incurred by the local authorities would have to be inserted in the other House. As to the method by which they were to satisfy themselves that there was a two-thirds majority, that was entirely a matter for the councils themselves. They might adopt the very cheap and easy method of circularising the shopkeepers. He was convinced that if they honestly endeavoured to do their duty there would be no difficulty in reasonably satisfying themselves on this point.

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 57; Not-Contents 21.

CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.
Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Devonshire, D. (*L. President.*)

Grafton, D.
Marlborough, D.
Somerset, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Lansdowne, M.

Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Camperdown, E.
Dartrey, E.
Denbigh, E.
Ducie, E.

Howe, E.
Morley, E.
Onslow, E.
Romney, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Stamford, E.
Stanhope, E.
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*)
Verulam, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]

Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
Goschen, V.

Salisbury, L. Bp.
Abinger, L.

Alverstone, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Avebury, L.
Balfour, L.
Barnard, L.
Belper, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Fairlie, L. (*E. Glasgow.*)
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Hylton, L.
Kelvin, L.
Kinnaird, L.
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lamington, L.
Lawrence, L.
Lindley, L.

Macnaghten, L.
Manners of Haddon, L. (*M. Granby.*)
Muncaster, L.
Newton, L.
Norton, L.
Oranmore and Browne, L.
Robertson, L.
Rosmead, L.
Saltoun, L.
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.
Wrottesley, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E. [*Teller.*]
Lytton, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Spencer, E.

Gordon, V. (*E. Aberdeen.*)
Rochester, L. Bp.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Burghclere, L.
Davey, L.
Denman, L.
Hamilton of Dalzell, L.
Monkswell, L.
Muskerry, L.
Reay, L.
Ribblesdale, L. [*Teller.*]
Sandhurst, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Wandsworth, L.

LORD BELPER, who had given notice of an Amendment providing that the Clause should read,—"if the council are satisfied that at least two-thirds of the occupiers of *each class of* shops affected approve the application"—said he did not intend to move the Amendment at this stage. The point which the Amendment was drafted to meet was one of some complexity. Clause 3 of the Bill provided that if at any time it was made to appear to the satisfaction of the council, that the occupiers of more than one-third in number of any class of shops to which an order for the time being in force under this Act related, were opposed to the continuance of the order, the council should make a report accordingly to the central authority, who might thereupon revoke the order in so far as it affected such class of shops. The object of the Amendment was to make Clause 1 conform with that provision, but he did not think the Amendment necessary at the present stage.

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

LORD BELPER moved to omit the sub-section providing that a draft order made under the section should not apply to shops belonging to any of the classes mentioned in the schedule—those classes being premises for the sale of intoxicating liquor, refreshment houses, tobacconists' shops, and news agencies. It appeared difficult to construe the two sets of provisions that appeared here and in Clause 5. It was much better to put them in one Clause, and he proposed to move a new Clause 5 later on to carry out this object.

Amendment moved:

"In Clause 1, line 20, to leave out subsection (3)."—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF LYTTON moved to leave out Clause 1, in order to insert a new Clause providing that the local authority, after giving notice and holding an inquiry, might establish such regulations as from time to time appeared to them necessary with regard to the closing of shops and the limitation of the hours of the shopworkers within the area under their jurisdiction. He said the object of the Amendment was to convert the Bill into one which was neither a Shopkeepers' Bill, as it was at the present moment, nor a Shop Assistants' Bill, as was the one introduced by Lord Arran, but a local option Bill pure and simple—that was to say, a Bill which left the full responsibility to the local councils, who were best qualified to know the needs of the particular districts under their jurisdiction. He believed that was more in accordance with the intentions of the Report of the Select Committee. The most rev. Primate had declared that the provision in the Bill with regard to the two-thirds majority was in accordance with the Report of that Committee, but if he would again refer to the Report he would find that there was no mention whatever of the initiative being left to the shopkeepers. The initiative, as he read the Report, was intended to be left to the local authorities; but after the decision which had been come to by their Lordships on Lord Ribblesdale's Amendment he would say no more on that point. His Amendment, however, went a great deal further than Lord Ribblesdale's, because it would do away with the dual control of the local and the central authorities and abolish the provisional order. The limitations of hours for assistants was essential, because the mere closing of the shops did not necessarily effect that limitation. Shop assistants were often kept working for hours after the closing of the shops in packing goods, or, more frequently, in sending out samples, and therefore any Bill which did not provide for the regulation of their hours of labour would not meet the grievances under which the assistants laboured.

He pointed out that a Resolution in favour of a regulation of the hours of labour was passed the other day in the House of Commons without a division, and with the support of the present Home Secretary. He had not included in his Amendment the sub-section in the present clause which provided that the hour fixed by the draft order for the closing of shops should not be earlier than seven o'clock in the evening, because he did not think that was consistent with his principle of leaving everything to the local authorities; but if his Amendment were accepted he would be prepared to insert that sub-section if it were thought necessary. The evil of long hours and their disastrous effect upon large portions of the community had been admitted for so long that it was high time some really effective steps were taken to put an end to the present state of affairs. Lord Avebury had declared that the Bill had the support of the shop assistants, but he could assure the noble Lord that that support was only given because they could not get anything better. Lord Arran's Bill was their Bill. He (Lord Lytton) would have thought, after the numerous Resolutions that had been passed on this subject by both Houses of Parliament, dating back to 1886, that the Government would themselves have taken the initiative in this matter, and have passed a Bill into law which would have had general support. But the division which had just been taken showed, not only that the Government were reluctant to take steps themselves, but that they were opposed to any very effective steps being taken by anybody else. The only Bills that were allowed to proceed were those which had very little chance of going any further, or those which, if passed, would have very little effect on the existing situation. He did not know to which category the present Bill belonged, but he thought it belonged to both. He could not help thinking that a Bill in which the only remedy offered was left in the hands of a majority of two-thirds of the shopowners, and which allowed a minority of just over one-third the right of undoing what was done by the majority would have very little effect on the present situation.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 1, and to insert the following new Clause: (1.) 'The local authority, as hereinafter defined, after giving notice and holding an enquiry, may establish such regulations as from time to time shall appear to them necessary with regard to the closing of shops and the limitation of the hours of the shop workers within the area under their jurisdiction; (2) Provided that, save as otherwise expressly provided in this Act, such regulations shall not apply to shops belonging to any of the classes mentioned in the schedule of this Act."—(*The Earl of Lytton.*)

*LORD AVEBURY thought that to a great extent the reasons which would guide their Lordships in voting upon this question had been dealt with on the Amendment already negatived. In speaking of the Bill as a shopkeepers' Bill he did not intend to imply in any way that it was in the interests of the shopkeepers rather than of the shop assistants, but simply that it had the general assent and support of the shopkeepers of the country. The noble Earl expressed the opinion that the shop assistants would prefer another Bill.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: I said they had a Bill of their own.

*LORD AVEBURY said the Bill referred to was the Bill of some of the shop assistants. The Grocers' Assistants Union were hearty supporters of the Bill now before their Lordships, and he could assure the House, having been in connection with Shop Assistants' Committees and Unions all over the country, that the great majority of the shop assistants preferred the proposal in his Bill to any other that had any chance of passing. They were convinced that if the Bill passed their hours of labour would be considerably reduced. The noble Earl was perfectly correct in stating that there was no mention of the two-thirds majority in the Committee's Report, but he confirmed the observation of the most rev. Primate that what was in the minds of the Committee was to preserve the initiative to the shopkeepers.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY explained that in making the statement that the Report of the Select Committee favoured a two-thirds majority of the shopkeepers, he had in his mind the draft Report, which was subsequently amended. He apologised for having inadvertently misled the House.

LORD BELPER resisted the Amendment, on the ground that it would destroy the whole Bill. The Amendment had been described as a very simple one. It was simple because it was a bold proposal to give absolute power, without any provisions or regulations, to the local authority, not only to deal with all the questions referred to in the Bill, but also to tackle the very thorny question of labour in shops and the hours of shop assistants, which went far beyond the scope of the present Bill. Moreover, there would be absolutely no appeal from their decision. He would ask their Lordships to consider what was the practice generally with regard to regulations of this sort. In the case of regulations made by local authorities, even of a comparatively trivial character, there was always an appeal to the Local Government Board or some other central authority, who had the power of saying, subject to Parliament, whether they approved of the regulations or not. But by the noble Earl's Amendment they would be giving to a minor local authority, to a district or urban council who had no knowledge or experience in the matter, absolute powers with regard to the closing of shops without an appeal to any central authority and without reserving to Parliament any voice in the matter. He ventured to say that a proposal of that kind was quite unprecedented, and likely to lead to very great inconvenience and injustice.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Clause 1 agreed to.

LORD BELPER said that the Secretary of State was advised that under the Bill as at present drafted each partner might be entitled to be counted as a separate occupier. In order to prevent that, he moved the insertion of the new clause standing in his name.

Amendment moved—

"To insert as a new clause: 'Where any shop is carried on by two or more persons in partnership, they shall be counted for the purposes of this section and of Section 3 as a single occupier.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

*LORD AVEBURY said that the Amendment carried out the intention of the promoters of the Bill.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2:

LORD RIBBLESDALE moved to amend Section 3 of Clause 2 by substituting the word "shall" for "may" in the provision which enacted that "after such consideration as aforesaid, the central authority may lay the draft order . . . before Parliament." He submitted this Amendment in order to make sure that, the central authority having satisfied itself in the matter, something would be done. He thought the provisions of the Bill were almost too polite to the central authority. When the other night he said he had a precedent for making it obligatory on the central authority to lay a provisional order before Parliament, the noble Lord representing the Home Office shook his head, apparently with cheerful confidence that there was no such precedent. He had since looked the reference up, and could now tell the noble Lord that the precedent was to be found in Section 3 of the Allotment Act, 1887. In Sub-section 2 of that section it was enacted that

"A county authority may make a provisional order."

and Sub-section 3 provided that—

"The Local Government Board, on the application of any county authority, *shall* introduce into Parliament a Bill confirming the provisional order made by such county authority."

He hoped the noble Lord would be able to accept his Amendment, which would give some guarantee that something would be done

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 2, line 16, to leave out 'may' and to insert 'shall.'—(*Lord Ribblesdale.*)

LORD BELPER trusted that the noble Lord in charge of the Bill would not accept the Amendment, which would make it obligatory upon the central authority to bring the draft order before Parliament, and would leave them no discretion in the matter. He had fully in his mind, when he shook his head the other night on the mention of precedent, the case to which the noble Lord had referred. It was quite true that in that case—and, he believed, in that case only—the Local Government Board had to introduce a Bill confirming the provisional order on the application of the county authority; but in the case of the Allotment Act the original authority to deal with the question was the district authority. The latter authority had power to acquire land, but, if compulsory purchase was necessary it had to appeal to the County Council, which was the superior and supervising authority. The County Council had to go fully into the whole question, and to hold an inquiry, and it was only in those circumstances that the Local Government Board, on the application of the County Council, had to make an order. He shook his head when the noble Lord referred to this because he did not think it was at all an analogous case.

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clause 4:

LORD BELPER moved to omit Clause 4, which provided that—

"If any question arises as to the class or classes of shops to which any particular shop belongs, or as to whether any particular place is a shop within the meaning of this Act, or as to whether a shop is or is not within the limits of the part of a district to which the order relates, such question may be referred to any court of summary jurisdiction having jurisdiction within the district, which may hear and determine the question."

Lord Ribblesdale.

He said it did not appear that the clause would be workable in its present form. In the first place there was no machinery for making the reference, and it was not said who the parties were to be to the reference, nor was any provision contained in the clause as to cost. The question as to the *status* of any particular shop could only arise in two cases—first, in proceedings for contravention of a closing order; and, secondly, when the views of the shopkeepers of any particular class were being ascertained. In the first instance it was clear that the clause would not be necessary, because any question raised in the course of the proceedings would be determined by the Court; and, with regard to the second point, a careful classification of shops would probably serve to reduce the difficulty to a minimum. As the clause was at present drawn, the Secretary of State thought it ought to be omitted.

Amendment moved:

"To leave out Clause 4."—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 5:

LORD BELPER moved to omit Clause 5 and to insert a new clause. He said his object was to deal with this difficult question in one clause and in a practical manner. He believed the Amendment carried out the intention of the noble Lord in charge of the Bill.

Amendment moved:

"To leave out Clause 5. and to insert the following new clause—(1) Nothing in this Act or in any order made thereunder shall apply to any shop in which the only trade carried on is one of the trades specified in the schedule. (2) A shop in which two or more trades are carried on shall be closed for the purpose of all such trades at the hour at which it is by any order under this Act required to be closed for the purpose of any of them: Provided that if any such trade is carried on solely in a part of the shop structurally separate from the rest of the shop, it shall be deemed to be carried on in a separate shop."—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 6 and 7 agreed to.

Clause 8:

LORD BELPER moved the omission of Sub-section 3, which provided that it should be the duty of every chief officer of police to cause the provisions of the Act and of any order under it to be enforced throughout the area of his authority, and the substitution of a new sub-section. This was, he said, a rather important Amendment, as it substituted inspection by the local authority for inspection by the police. It was thought that inspection by the police would be objectionable from a police point of view, it would add very materially to their work, and would probably be disliked by the shopkeepers. Moreover, it was contrary to precedent. In the case of the Factory Acts, the Mines Acts and the Shop Hours Acts, these duties were undertaken by inspectors; and in the case of the latter Acts the inspectors were under the local authority. His Amendment would have the effect of also placing the duty of inspection under this Bill upon the local authority. He did not think it was a matter which ought to be introduced into an Act of Parliament, but he understood there would be no difficulty in giving instructions to the police that in cases where they noticed an infringement they should call the attention of the inspector to it.

Amendment moved:

"In Clause 8, page 3, to leave out Sub-section 3 and to insert as a new sub-section the provisions of the Shops Hour Acts, 1892 and 1893, with regard to the appointment, powers, and salaries of inspectors shall be deemed to apply for the purposes of this Act."—(*Lord Belper.*)

*LORD AVEBURY said that, although there was at first some objection to this clause on the part of shopkeepers, they eventually accepted it because they were anxious that there should be some certainty that the provisions of the Bill would be carried into operation. He would not, however, resist the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 8, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 9 to 11 agreed to.

Clause 12:

LORD BELPER, in moving the omission of Clause 12, said this Amendment was consequential upon the alteration which had been agreed to with regard to Clause 5.

Amendment moved:

"To leave out Clause 12." (*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 13:

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH) intimated that at a later stage of the Bill he would place an Amendment on the Paper to interpret the term "county fund" in the case of Scotland.

Clause 13 agreed to.

Clause 14 agreed to.

Clause 15:

LORD BURGHCLERE inquired whether the authority for London was to be the London County Council or the municipal boroughs.

LORD AVEBURY said, with regard to Lord Belper's suggestion that he should place an Amendment on the Paper dealing with the case of London, that he thought it would be more convenient if the Government would consider which was the most suitable authority and draft the necessary Amendment. They had better opportunities than he had of coming to a wise decision on the point.

LORD BELPER promised that the Government would consider the case of London at a later stage of the Bill.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

Clause 15, as amended, agreed to.

LORD BELPER, replying to Lord Avebury, said that the necessary alterations in the schedule consequent upon the Amendments that had been agreed to would be made in the Standing Committee.

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended.

LIGHT LOCOMOTIVES (IRELAND) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1:

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (The MARQUESS of LONDONDERRY) said the Amendments standing in his name were put down on behalf of the Irish Local Government Board, who felt that they should not only be recognised, but should be allowed to exercise their authority. The first three sections of the clause, as he proposed to amend them, would read:

> "(1) The Council of any administrative county may, on the application of any persons or club, by order declare that any public roads within the county may be used for races with light locomotives during the whole or part of any days specified in order, not exceeding three days in the year. (2) The order shall contain such provisions as may be required by the Local Government Board for Ireland for the temporary suspension and regulation of other traffic for the safety of the public, for the restriction of speed in populous places, and for other purposes incident to the proper conduct of such races. (3) Such public notice as may be required by the Local Government Board for Ireland shall be given of the provisions of the order.

His noble friend the Marquess of Granby had an Amendment on the Paper to insert, after the words "roads within the county," in Section 1, the words "being main roads now maintained by and under the control of the County Council." He (Lord Londonderry) thought his Amendments would meet the point of the noble Marquess.

Amendments moved—

> "In Clause 1, page 1, line 6, after the second 'any' to insert 'public';" "in line 10, to leave out 'may' and to insert 'shall,' and to leave out from 'as' to 'for' in line 11, and to insert 'may be required by the Local Government Board for 'Ireland'" ; "in line 15, at the beginning of paragraph (3) to insert 'such,' and after 'notice' to insert 'as may be required by the Local Government Board for Ireland;" "in line 16, to leave out from 'order' to end of the paragraph." — (*The Marquess of Londonderry.*)

Lord Belper.

On Question, Amendments agreed to.

THE MARQUESS OF GRANBY said the words which had been inserted on the Motion of the noble Marquess removed his objection, and he therefore withdrew his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining Clauses agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived: The Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next; and Bill to be printed as amended.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL [H.L.]

House in Committee (according to order).

Clause I:

LORD ALVERSTONE moved to leave out the words "and without the knowledge of his principal" from Clause 1, which enacted that—

> "If any agent corruptly and without the knowledge of his principal accepts or obtains, or agrees to accept or attempts to obtain, from any person for himself or for any other person, any gift or consideration as an inducement or reward for doing or forbearing to do any act in relation to his principal's business, or for showing or forbearing to show favour or disfavour to any person in relation to his principal's business," etc.

It seemed better to rely on the word "corruptly" without the additional words.

Amendment moved:

> "In Clause 1, page 1, lines 5 and 6 to leave out 'and without the knowledge of his principal.'"—(*Lord Alverstone.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD ALVERSTONE said the next Amendment standing in his name was designed to meet the case mentioned by him on the Second Reading of bribes which were given after the act had been performed.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 9, after 'do' to insert 'or for having done or forborne to do.'"—(*Lord Alverstone.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said he had received a long and earnest remonstrance from persons not otherwise averse to the Bill on the ground that the effect of the Amendment would be to reopen old transactions, the evidence applicable to which had long since perished. He had thought fit to mention this to the House although he did not oppose the Amendment.

LORD ALVERSTONE pointed out that the Bill would have no retrospective action. The Amendment had reference to future transactions where the bribes were not paid at the time.

LORD DAVEY said he understood the Amendment to mean that any payment of this kind would be a corrupt payment if it were made after the event as recompense or reward.

LORD ALVERSTONE: That is so.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD moved an Amendment to cover the case of any person whose duty it is to order or receive goods on behalf of his principal who should in consequence of so doing receive any recompense or gift from the person supplying such goods without the knowledge of the principal. He felt that it was quite unnecessary to comment upon the evils arising from the practice of servants taking gifts from tradesmen in this way. The principal either paid higher prices, received inferior goods, or was deceived by false quantities; and he had drawn the Clause explicitly in order to bring this offence within the Act. He had omitted the word "corruptly," because he wished to make the mere act of an agent or servant receiving such gifts an offence in itself. The noble and learned Lord might contend that this case was met in the second sub-section, but there it must be proved that the gift was given as an inducement or reward for doing or forbearing to do any act in relation to the principal's business. It would be difficult to prove that anything whatever was said, when the gift was made, as to furthering the interests of the tradesman. He hoped the noble and learned Lord would accept the Amendment. He proposed, on the Report stage, to move an Amendment making the giving of a bribe on the part of a tradesman also an offence. The punishment mentioned was the maximum punishment, and if the offence was not shown to be of a grave character, the punishment would probably only be a fine; but such a provision would go a long way in the direction of putting an end to this objectionable practice.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, line 12, after 'or' to insert 'if any person whose duty it is to order or receive goods on behalf of his principal, shall, in consequence of so doing, receive any recompense or gift from the person supplying such goods without the knowledge of the principal or'")—(*Lord James of Hereford.*)

LORD BURGHCLERE hoped the noble and learned Lord would accept the Amendment. He had the honour of serving on the Committee, of which the late Lord Chief Justice was chairman, and he believed he was right in saying that the opinion of the Committee was that these payments should be rendered illegal when the agent or servant obtained them without the knowledge of the principal. He submitted that the word "corruptly" practically knocked the bottom out of the Bill; but, as there was no chance of eliminating that word, he supported very warmly the Amendment moved by the noble and learned Lord opposite.

*EARL SPENCER said he hardly liked to intervene in a matter so technical, but he would like to quote a case that had come to his knowledge, which he did not think either the Bill or the Amendment touched. It was the case of an insurance company which had been in the habit of paying to the account of the agent of a person whose estate had been insured a sum annually in respect of the business introduced many years ago. He understood that that was not only a common pratice in the case of clerks or agents of landed proprietors, but that it obtained among solicitors as well. He maintained that the principle was absolutely wrong, and said that, directly the person to whom he referred learned that his agent was receiving this payment, he took the matter up, and on stating that the practice was at once to cease, was able to get from the insurance office a reduction of something like 25 per cent. in his premiums. Surely that was a payment which ought to be covered by the Bill.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said he was somewhat amused, if he might say so, at what the noble Earl had just stated, because he had that day received a very long remonstrance from a person who declared that the practice to which the noble Earl had referred was perfectly honest, and that the Bill would prevent it. He thought his noble friend Lord Burghclere could not have read the Amendment which he (the Lord Chancellor) had placed on the Paper, chiefly in view of what the noble Lord himself said on the Second Reading, and which he would move later. He would have thought that that Amendment, while retaining the proposition that in order to make the giving of a gratuity an offence it must be given corruptly, introduced words which amply supplied the deficiencies of which the noble Lord complained, for it provided that where it was shown that any gift or consideration had been taken, given, or offered without the assent of the principal, the burden of proving that such gift or consideration was not taken, given, or offered corruptly should lie on the accused. If the Amendment moved by Lord James was accepted, they would be endeavouring to specify what it was quite unnecessary to specify. It had to be proved, in order to get rid of the imputation of corruption, that the principal assented to the gift, and if the principal assented there was no corruption at all. But if it was given without the assent of the principal, the operation of the section was to make it corrupt within the meaning of the Act. Why was it that the butcher gave a Christmas-box to the cook? His impression was that he did it for good consideration, and therefore the section, as he proposed to amend it, would undoubtedly hit that case. He could not accept Lord James's Amendment.

*EARL SPENCER: Does the noble and learned Lord think the case I brought forward would be met?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Yes.

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD submitted that if the word "corruptly" remained the whole Bill would be rendered nugatory, and the system they were seeking to touch would go unpunished. It was clear that the prosecutor would be told that it was no good his proving that his cook or his gamekeeper had received gifts, but that he must prove that they were given corruptly. How was he to prove corruption? The mere act of an agent or servant receiving these gifts should constitute an offence.

LORD ALVERSTONE thought the point would be fully covered by the Amendment standing in the name of the Lord Chancellor.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said he could not conceive of any doubt existing as to what would happen in the case suggested by the noble and learned Lord. If the gift was made without the assent of the principal, if no legitimate or honourable reason could be shown by the accused why the money was given, if the giving of it could not be justified, then it would, in pursuance of the Amendment he proposed to move later, be corruptly given within the meaning of the statute. If they made the Act too severe they would raise up opposition to it, and its passage might be endangered. He could not, therefore, accept the noble and learned Lord's Amendment.

LORD DAVEY agreed with the Lord Chancellor that the giving of these commissions ought not to be made a criminal offence unless it was corrupt. As to the point raised by Lord James, he did not apprehend any difficulty. If a servant or agent received a bribe contrary to the known wishes and orders of his master, no one would say that that was not corrupt.

VISCOUNT GOSCHEN said the point that struck him as a layman was: Was there any substantial difference between the Amendment of the Lord Chancellor and that moved by Lord James? Would the Lord Chancellor tell the House whether the system would be condemned as decidedly and definitely by the acceptance of his (the Lord Chancellor's) Amendment, as it would be by the acceptance of Lord James's Amendment?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I think even more so. May I read my Amendment? It provides that—

"For the purposes of this Act, where it is shown that any such gift or consideration as in this section mentioned has been taken, given, or offered without the assent of the principal, the burden of proving that such gift or consideration was not taken, given, or offered corruptly shall lie on the accused."

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD asked the noble and learned Lord to take the case, for instance, of a cartridge seller who gave a gamekeeper £10. The evidence stopped there. Where would his noble and learned friend's Amendment be of the slightest use in such a case? The Amendment would throw on the gamekeeper the burden of proving that it was not corruptly given. If the gamekeeper said "I swear upon my oath that nothing whatever was said," and the cartridge seller confirmed him, where was the corruption? Unless his (Lord James's) Amendment were accepted they would be doing nothing whatever to stop this system.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said a good many corrupt bargains were made without any words being exchanged at all. In the case referred to, the tribunal would ask itself: "Why was this £10 given?" and if the gamekeeper could not give a satisfactory reason it would not be a very unfair inference to draw that it was given for the purpose condemned by the Bill. If the Amendment of his noble and learned friend were adopted it would imperil the passing of the measure.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

LORD ALVERSTONE said the object of the Amendments standing in his name was to make the punishments the same as in the Bill known as Lord Randolph Churchill's Act of 1889. It was agreed that the punishments ought not to be less in this case than in the Act which had been on the Statute-book for thirteen years.

Amendments moved.

"In line 27, to leave out 'one year,' and insert 'two years'; in line 28, after 'pounds,' to insert 'or to both such imprisonment and such fine'; and in line 30, after 'pounds,' to insert 'or to both such imprisonment and such fine'"—(*Lord Alverstone.*)

On Question, Amendments agreed to.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR moved an Amendment providing that a person serving under the Crown is an agent within the meaning of the Act. His own impression was that the words were unnecessary, but as some doubt had been expressed as to whether persons serving under the Crown came within the Act, he moved the Amendments to make the point clear.

Amendment moved.

"In Clause 1, page 2, after line 4, to insert '(3) A person serving under the Crown is an agent within the meaning of this Act.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said the object of the fourth sub-section which he now moved was to put an end to the idea that where the practice of giving these gifts were customary in any trade it was therefore admissible.

Amendment moved.

"To insert '(4) In any prosecution under this Act evidence shall not be admissible to show that any such gift or consideration as is mentioned in this section is customary in any trade or calling.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

*LORD DAVEY agreed that it ought not to be a defence as between a tradesman and a servant to say that the gift was customary. But what would his noble and learned friend say of a parting guest who had been staying at a friend's house giving a tip to the footman who had attended him? It was not usual to consult the host as to what tip one would give a servant. Would not custom in that case be an answer to a charge of corruption?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said that such a case as that would not come within the Act at all. Every host knew perfectly well that tips were given.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said the fifth sub-section which he proposed to add to Clause 1 had already been read to the House, and he hoped there would be no opposition offered to it.

Amendment moved—

"To insert (5) for the purposes of this Act, where it is shown that any such gift or consideration as in this section mentioned has been taken, given, or offered without the assent of the principal, the burden of proving that such gift or consideration was not taken, given, or offered corruptly shall lie on the accused."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD said he recognised his hon. and learned friend's effort to meet the difficulty with regard to the word "corruptly," and he regarded the Amendment as a great improvement. But he wished to ask the hon. and learned Lord one question. Supposing an agent or servant admitted that a tradesman sent him £5 and he kept it, but stated most emphatically that not one word passed between him and the tradesman, would that be a corrupt act or not?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I should say most unquestionably it would, unless some good reason was proved by the servant why he received the £5.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Bill recommitted to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended.

BANK HOLIDAYS (IRELAND) BILL.

House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a on Monday next.

MARINE INSURANCE BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment; and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

SHOPS (HOURS OF CLOSING) BILL [H.L.]

Bill (on Motion), by leave of the House, withdrawn.

THE FREE CHURCH COUNCIL AND THE EDUCATION ACT.

THE LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he will inform the House in how many cases schemes have been presented to the Board under Section 17 of the Education Act, 1902, providing for the appointment of persons nominated or recommended by a body called "The Free Church Council," or any similar non-educational religious body; and further if he will inform the House what is the policy of the Board in dealing with such provisions. Perhaps it would save trouble if I say a few words in regard to the attitude which I take in this matter. I am one of those who entirely welcome the Act of last year. I am very thankful, particularly, for that part of it which unifies the whole of the education throughout the country, and I am very glad, also, that we are to have local Committees consisting of representatives of the ratepayers, and, in many cases, representatives also of other bodies which, in the wording of the Act, are interested in education and acquainted with the needs of the various kinds of schools in the area over which the council has jurisdiction. I should also like to say that I speak to-night, not as representing the Church of England, but from an educational point of view. It is most important that these persons should be the strongest men and women that can possibly be found in the locality, that they should be able to hold their own, and should be subject to no suspicion of partisanship. It will be extremely difficult, in many of our local councils, to carry on this business of education if there is any half-heartedness at all in the persons who come from outside. We have, then, to look to the Board of Education for protection in regard to the choice of these persons. The Board of Education have to approve the schemes of the local councils, and unless they approve them I presume the schemes have to be returned to the councils and amended. No doubt a great deal of negotiation has been going on with the Board of Education on points of this kind.

I have found out somewhat accidentally that there are numerous cases in which a body called the Free Church Council is asked either to nominate or to recommend persons on these Committees. I do not in the least wish to attack the Free Church Council. It has some very admirable principles, and I have no doubt that a great deal of its work is excellent. I have read the last report of the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches, and I find in it much with which I agree. Its social work is no doubt of an agitative rather than of an administrative kind, but it is a body which is worthy of respect as a voluntary society of our fellow Christians. The question, however, is not "Does it do good work in some respects?" but "Is it educationally competent for the particular business which, I understand, it is to be called upon to do in numerous centres throughout the country?" Now, if we take the work of the Free Church Council, which of course is the federation of all the other similar councils in the country, and is, I believe, of exactly the same type, we find that it corresponds to what is being done in the Church of England by the Church Army, by the Board of Church Defence, and by, I should say, the English Church Union, that is to say, it is agitative and not administrative work. It is doing its best to enlighten public opinion on religious subjects, and to promote different measures, but it has no knowledge of education as a body. It does not profess, indeed, to have anything to do with founding schools, and it is not part of the business of the National Council to build schools, or to assist financially any such enterprise. I find those words in their own report. Then what is its interest in schools? It has an interest, no doubt. That interest was shown very forcibly by the opposition which was raised, to a very great extent, by the National Free Church Council to the measure which was carried last session, and that opposition is expressed in the report for 1902 in strong and trenchant language. I do not say that the language is excessive or abusive—I do not wish in the least to be guilty of exaggeration—but I do say that it does not show any sympathetic interest in the working of the Act. It shows, on the contrary, that the Free Church Council, as a body, is entirely opposed to the principles of the Act. I therefore felt that it was fair, in no spirit of opposition to the employment of Dissenters upon this work, to ask the question which stands in my name. On the contrary, I very much desire that leading Nonconformists of every school should be upon these educational authorities, and that we should have the benefit of their knowledge and experience, but not that men should be appointed who are opposed to the successful working of the Act. I should like to ask the noble Marquess whether it is the opinion of the Board of Education that this body is likely, either in its national form or in its local councils, to appoint persons of experience in education and persons who are acquainted with the needs of the various kinds of schools in the area over which the education authority acts.

Lord BURGHCLERE: Before the noble Marquess answers the question I would venture to ask him whether the right rev. Prelate has given an accurate interpretation of the Act. The right rev. Prelate dwelt very strongly on the words "persons of experience in education," but he omitted the words which immediately precede them, "of other bodies." There is nothing which indicates that the body is to be primarily of an educational nature.

The LORD BISHOP of SALISBURY: I asked the noble Marquess whether he thought this body was likely to appoint persons of experience in education.

Lord BURGHCLERE: Yes, but the right rev. Prelate dwelt very much on the words "persons of experience in education," and omitted to mention the words which precede them. It is not necessary that the bodies referred to should be educational bodies. I would call the attention of the noble Marquess to a case which, I am informed, has occurred at Burnley. The council proposed in their scheme that there should be two members of the Voluntary Schools Association and one member of the Free Church Council. The Board of Education in their reply recommended that one of the members of the Voluntary Schools Association should be struck out and that they should leave out altogether the person to be chosen from the Free

Church Council on the ground that that was not primarily an educational body. I venture to assert that in taking that action the Board of Education were acting *ultra vires.* I would point out to the right rev. Prelate that the Free Church Council takes a deep interest in education, as he himself showed by referring to the action they took with regard to the Education Bill of last year; and I venture to think that if undenominational schools are to be represented at all in many districts the Free Church Council is certainly the body which ought to be consulted as to the person to be nominated.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (the MARQUESS of LONDONDERRY): My Lords, the right rev. Prelate has asked me a question of which I do not in the least complain. Indeed, after the remarks of the noble Lord who has just sat down, I am extremely glad of the opportunity of explaining the position which the Board of Education desire to take with regard to the administration of the Act of last year. Nineteen schemes seem to have been submitted to the Board containing proposals for the representation of the Free Church Council on the Education Committee. In dealing with these and all other provisions as to the composition of Education Committees the Board have consistently endeavoured to secure that every Committee shall comprise, in accordance with the Act, persons of experience in education and persons acquainted with the needs of the various kinds of schools in the area. In the particular case which, as I understand, the right rev. Prelate has had specially before him, it seems that there are no associations or bodies representative of Nonconformist schools. Therefore, as the town council scheme provides for the inclusion on the Committee of two members representative of Church of England schools, and one representative of Roman Catholic interests in education, it would seem strictly in accordance with the spirit and intention of the Act, and with the consistent policy of the Board of Education in administering the Act, that some convenient means should be adopted for securing the representation of Nonconformist interests also on the Committee. As a rule, where a council has included in a draft scheme a representative of the Free Church Council, the Board have felt that some representation of the managers or associations of Nonconformist elementary schools would have been preferable and more in accordance with the terms of the Act as to persons acquainted with the needs of the various kinds of schools. But, in reply to this view, whenever the council have expressed their opinion that the object in view was best attained by a representation of the Free Church Council itself, the Board have raised no objections, and the schemes have been published accordingly.

The Board have endeavoured to be absolutely impartial and judicial in these matters, and to hold the scales evenly. The Board have always given the greatest consideration to the views put forward by the local authorities. It would be impossible for the Board in a city like Salisbury to ask for a religious census. As long as the different denominations seem to be honestly represented, the Board have accepted the scheme, although in certain circumstances they have asked for reasons why certain representatives had been placed on the Committees. We have never thought it right in any way to oppose the proposals submitted to us in those schemes. The right rev. Prelate states that there should be placed on these Education Committees the strongest men and the strongest women. I do not think the Board of Education can decide who are the strongest men and the strongest women in a district; that must be left to the discretion of the local authorities. The speech made last night by my colleague Sir William Anson, in which he declared that we wish to be absolutely impartial in the matter, and not to dictate, but only to make suggestions to the education authorities, entirely expresses the policy of the Board of Education in this matter. We leave to the education authority the right to discriminate as to the representatives of the various bodies they submit to us, and so long as we consider they are not acting with any injustice to any other body we shall continue to accept their schemes. The noble Lord opposite drew attention to an alleged injustice in the case of Burnley.

LORD BURGHCLERE: I did not say it was an injustice

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: I understood the noble Lord to say that the town of Burnley was unjustly treated.

LORD BURGHCLERE: I am not authorised to speak on behalf of Burnley. I merely called attention to the case

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: The noble Lord stated, I think, that Burnley submitted their scheme to us, and that we did not accept it.

LORD BURGHCLERE: My information was that Burnley submitted a certain scheme, and that the Board of Education suggested alterations.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: That is perfectly true, but what happened was this, that when the Burnley authority did not accept the suggestion of the Board of Education, we did not enforce it. Therefore I do not think that we have done any injustice to the town of Burnley. At this late hour I do not think it is necessary for me to go further into the question, but I would repeat that it is the desire of the Board of Education to administer the Act with absolute impartiality.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Seven o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 20th March, 1903.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

MAIDSTONE GAS BILL.

Petition for additional provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.

Petition from Newcastle and Gateshead, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Farnell, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES ASSESSMENT AND RATING BILL.

Petition from Manchester, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PADAIYACHI, VEERABADRA.

Petition from Veerabadra Padaiyachi, for inquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC HOUSES (HOURS OF CLOSING) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petitions against: from Aylesbury; Camelford; Sheffield (two); Ventnor; Wivenhoe; Wells; Chard; Swansea; Sandgate; Cannock; Mining Association of Great Britain; Newtown and Llanidloes; Colchester; Hemsworth; Darfield; Royston; and Durham; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL

Petitions in favour: from Nottingham; and Manchester; to lie upon the Table.

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

Petitions against establishment: from Benhar Moor; Dumbarton; and Rothesay; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Romsey; and Wimbledon; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1881 (ORDERS).

Copies presented, of two Orders in Council, dated 16th March, 1903, with respect to the importation of arms and ammunition for the purpose of adding Arklow to the ports at which explosives may be landed [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (WEST RIDING OF THE COUNTY OF YORK).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the West Riding of the county of York altering certain polling districts in the Shipley, Sowerby, Holmfirth, and Morley Parliamentary Divisions [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CROFTERS' HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACTS.

Copy presented, of Report of the Crofters' Commission for the year 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Public Worship Regulation and Church Discipline.

MR. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will explain why the representation made to the Bishop of Rochester under the 8th Section of The Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, by Colonel Porcelli in 1900 is not included in the Return ordered on the 11th instant (Parliamentary Paper No. 69).

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) No representation by Colonel Porcelli is included in the Return in question because there is no record of any such representation having been made under Section 8 of The Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874. I am informed that Colonel Porcelli proceeded under the Church Discipline Act of 1840.

Volunteers—New Musketry Regulations.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state what is the constitution of the Council of Advice at the War Office as regards the Volunteer force; and if the new Musketry Regulations just promulgated have been submitted to the Council and approved thereby.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) My hon. and gallant friend will find the constitution of the Board on page 50 of the current month's *Army List.* The new Musketry Regulations for the Volunteers were issued before the Board was formed; but the course laid down is optional for this year, and no obligatory course will be instituted without the option of the Board being first obtained.

Army Estimates—Appendices.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfarshire): To ask the Secretary of State for War when the further Appendices to Army Estimates will be issued to complete the information laid before Parliament, including the Appendices relating to staff of Military Prisons (numbers and pay); establishments of the Clothing Department; staff for Engineer Services, by stations; and the statement of the sums provided in the Army Estimates for military purposes in the Colonies and Egypt.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The Appendix relating to the establishments of the Clothing Department has been discontinued since 1899–1900, as the information is now given in the body of the Vote itself. The other Appendices have been temporarily discontinued since 1900–1 owing to the war, but it is proposed to include them in the Estimates for 1904–5.

Sandhurst Military Cadets — Cost of Second Year's Training.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will say whether the cost of the second year's instruction at Sandhurst for military cadets will be paid by the parents or the State.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The cost will be paid by the parents under arrangements similar to those now prescribed by the regulations for payment during the cadet's residence at the college.

Contracts for Agricultural Implements for South Africa—British and Foreign Tenderers.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state what contracts for agricultural implements and machinery have been given out by the Imperial authorities at Pretoria, and what proportion of them have gone to the United Kingdom and foreign countries respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) I have communicated with Lord Milner by telegraph, and he informs me as follows:—"Your telegram of 14th March, No. 2. The following orders have been placed outside South Africa: One, set of steam ploughing tackle, ploughs, and harrows; Fowler, Leeds. Implements experiment farm, Ransoms, Sims, and Jefferies, J. and F. Howard, and others, England; Massy Harris and Company, Canada; 15,000 harrows, Crown agents." The order for the 15,000 harrows was of great urgency, and, in order to secure prompt delivery, about one-half of the order was placed with British manufacturers, about one-quarter with a Canadian firm, and the remaining quarter with an American firm.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

*MR. CHAPMAN (Cheshire, Hyde), in moving the Second Reading of the Rating of Machinery Bill, said: I do not propose to trouble the House by going into its ancient history. I will merely recall the fact that it has passed its Second Reading six times, once without a division; that it has never been thrown out; that it has once passed the Committee on Trade without alteration; and that it has always had the support of the Local Government Board until the last session. Time, unfortunately, has prevented its proceeding further, but I hope sincerely that on this occasion perseverance may meet with its reward, and that the Bill may eventually reach the Statute-book.

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present, the House counted, and there being only 27 Members present, the sitting was suspended until a quorum was formed.

There being a quorum present at five minutes past One.

*MR. CHAPMAN resumed his speech in moving the Second Reading of the Bill. He said he feared he could not make so technical a subject interesting. All he could hope for was to make a fair and businesslike statement of the case. The object of the measure was, he said, not to alter the statute law, but to bring matters into the state of uniformity which prevailed before the varying decisions were given. It was not proposed to abolish the tax on machinery, but to free small industries from the burden of higher rates and taxes than they have hitherto had to pay. It was in effect to relieve small industries from the burden of taxation. He would not again give the cases in full which he had quoted last session, but he might state that the chief reason for bringing forward the Bill was that action had been rendered necessary by the operation of the well-known Tyne Boiler case of 1886. In that case Lord Esher decided that machinery was not rateable, *per se*, but that certain classes of machinery were to be taken into account in estimating the value of the buildings containing it. The question *how* it was to be taken into account had been the battle-ground of assessment committees and manufacturers, leading to endless and costly litigation. The shafting and first-motor power had always been rated. While some assessment committees excluded tenants' machinery, other committees assessed it. These divergent methods of carrying out the judgment had led to endless confusion and a very large expenditure of money. This Bill affirmed that any machinery which the tenant provided was not to increase the value of the buildings and the first motor power which the landlord would supply.

This system of rating existed at the present day, he believed, in Lancashire and the West Riding of Yorkshire.

Let them take an example of the way in which their opponents' view of the law would hamper small industries. He took the case of a man, say a foreman, who had saved some money and wished to start an industry of his own. He rents a shed or building where the power was provided by the landlord, and into which he placed a machine worth £1,000. If he was taxed at 5 per cent. on its value, that equalled £50. Then he was rated at 10s. on £50. That was £25 per annum. This, at twenty-five years' purchase at 4 per cent., was equal to £625 of unremunerative capital that his business had to bear the burden of. Many large industries had been built up from small beginnings, and in these days of intense foreign competition industry and hard work ought not to be strangled at the beginning. He thought he would be forgiven if he quoted the saying—"Tax the honey when the bees have made it if you like, but do not stop the making of the honey by taxing the bees who make it." He would try to meet as fairly as he could some of the objections which had been brought against the Bill. It had been called a Bill to exempt all machinery from rating, and it was said that assessment committees were against it. This was not the case, as the heavy class of machinery did not come under the Bill, nor did he know of a single assessment committee winning an appeal at Quarter Sessions to rate all machinery alike. Then came the complaint of the agricultural constituencies. It was said that their rates would be increased. There was a cry for factories to be erected in the country. These would find employment for men and women on the spot, and so relieve the congestion of the towns, and this would be to some extent a method of dealing with the problem of housing the masses. This could not be done if the tenants or moveable machinery were to be rated. He claimed, therefore, the support of the agricultural interest if industries were to spring up in the country.

A strong argument in favour of this Bill was provided by what had taken place in Scotland. A Scotch assessor last year rated the movable machines in a foundry at Dundee at 7½ per cent. of their value. His action was approved by the Court of Appeal in Scotland, thereby upsetting their system of rating. Did Scotland sit down under this? No; the hon. Member for West Renfrewshire (Sir C. Renshaw) brought in a Bill on the same lines and almost the same words as the Bill now before the House. It was accepted by the Government, ran through the House unopposed, and became law at the end of the session. It was called "An Act to amend the Lands Valuation (Scotland) Acts in regard to the Law relating to the Rating of Machinery" [8th August, 1902], and Clause I. was as follows—

> "Section 42 of the Valuation Act, 1854, shall be read and construed as if the following proviso were inserted after the words, 'and all machinery fixed or attached to any lands or heritages'—that is to say, provided that in any building occupied for any trade, business, or manufacturing process the expression, 'machinery fixed or attached,' shall be construed as including all machinery, machines, or plant, in or on the lands or heritages for producing or transmitting first motive power, or for heating or lighting such building, but save as herein provided shall not include machines, tools, or appliances, which are only so fixed that they can be removed from their place without necessitating the removal of any part of the building."

Thus the law in Scotland was quite clear, but English manufacturers had to fight at Quarter Sessions for justice. Scotland had coal and iron industries as well as England, and he thought he might fairly say that what was good for Scotland in this matter could not be bad for England. Next he had the large demand for the Bill from numerous organisations, Chambers of Commerce, and Trade Societies. His final argument was that the Royal Commission on Local Taxation, which was presided over by Lord Balfour of Burleigh, had recommended what this measure proposed to enact. The Bill was almost a reprint of the recommendation of the Commission. The Report of the Commission contained the following—

> "It is beyond controversy that, in any amendment of the existing law, the main object to be aimed at must be the removal of all uncertainty as to what kinds of machinery are, and what are not, to be taken into account in estimating the rateable value of factories. To attain this object by any sort of definition or enumeration, would be wholly impracticable. . . . Having regard to all the history and circumstances of the case, we are of opinion

that the adoption of the proposals contained in the Bill, introduced into the House of Commons in 1899, as to the class of machinery which should be taken into account in estimating the rateable value of premises containing machinery, would be a fair solution of this difficult problem. These proposals exclude the classes of machinery which, in our opinion, it is desirable should be exempted. The law as to what machinery should be included in the assessment of premises containing it, would also be more precise; greater uniformity in practice among Assessment Committees would be secured, and the probability of litigation lessened. We therefore recommend that in estimating the rateable value of any hereditament occupied for trade, business, or manufacturing purposes, there should be excluded from the assessment any increased value arising from machines, tools, or appliances which are not fixed or are only so fixed that they can be removed from their place without necessitating the removal of any part of the hereditament. But the value of any machinery, machine, or plant used in or on the hereditament for producing or transmitting first motive power, or for heating or lighting the hereditament, should be included."

These were really the words of the Bill, the Second Reading of which he now asked the House to pass. He claimed to have proved (1) that the Bill met a pressing need; (2) that it did not alter the statute law, but made clear what was now chaotic; (3) that it would save enormous expense in constant ligitation; and (4) that it would prevent the hampering of our industries by the non-interference with the machinery of our mills, and so cheapen the methods of the production. He contended that the Bill was demanded by a multitude of trade organisations, Chambers of Commerce, as well as by the working artisans, as he could testify from his own constituency, which consisted largely of manufacturing towns and villages. Finally, the Bill was directly on the lines recommended by the final Report of the Royal Commission of 1901 on Local Taxation, and as such he recommended it to the consideration of the House, and he hoped that hon. Members would, in their deliberations, not forget the working bees.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil) said he congratulated the hon. Member on the moderate terms in which he had moved the Second Reading of this Bill, and he would endeavour to follow his arguments in the same spirit. The hon. Member said that this Bill had passed its Second Reading on many previous occasions, and had never been rejected; and he argued that that was an indication of the support behind his Bill. He should like to add to the thrice-told tale of this hardy annual thus given to the House a brief chronological index, and to point out that although the measure had been carried a number of times, it had been so by dwindling majorities. He had a strong impression that the reason for that was that when the Bill was first introduced in 1887, and its Second Reading passed without opposition and without discussion, its real meaning was not understood either by hon. Members or the country, but that the more the country and the House came to know of it, the less they liked it. In 1893, in the next Parliament, the Bill was passed by a majority of 153, and on the next occasion, in 1895, that majority went down to fifty-one. In 1899 so little interest was taken in the Bill that the House was counted out, and the only other occasion on which the Bill had been presented was last year, when it was passed by a majority of thirty-five, or about a fifth of the majority in 1893. He should like to enter his protest against the title of the Bill, which was altogether misleading. It was unquestionably the fact that the title of the Bill had even misled hon. Members. The title was "Rating of Machinery Bill," whereas it was in reality a Bill for the exemption of machinery from rating. The hon. Member talked about taxing the honey bees, but the object of the Bill was to transfer the taxation from one bee to another. As to the attitude of the Government in regard to this Bill, he understood the hon. Gentleman to suggest that the Local Government Board approved of this Bill, but there was no record of that in *Hansard*. On the contrary, he thought the action of Government had been, during the last fifteen years, always that of strict neutrality.

*MR. CHAPMAN: What about Sir Henry Fowler's Bill?

*MR. D. A. THOMAS said that if the right hon. Member for Wolverhampton had supported the measure he had done so entirely in his individual capacity, and not as a member of the Government.

The Bill did not define the law, as was alleged by the hon. Member, but its actual meaning was to completely change the law. In 1895, when the Bill was before the House, Lord Llandaff, then Mr. Matthews, a former Home Secretary, stated—

> "The law of rating had not altered in the least for the last 100 years. He had no hesitation in saying that the Bill altered the law fundamentally, and to the advantage of one class only."

And last year the President of the Local Government Board said—

> "I cannot admit that there is any doubt as to the law. The direction of the Assessment Committees is perfectly clear."

The Tyne Boiler case clearly interpreted the law in this matter. In an appeal which came last year before the Lord Chief Justice, who was intimately acquainted with the Tyne Boiler case, he having being engaged in it as one of the counsel, he said—

> "The Tyne Boiler case was most carefully stated, in order to endeavour to make the question of attachment to the freehold the crucial test, and the court was asked to find that unless the machines were attached, they were not to be taken into consideration at all in enhancing the value of the premises. That the Court of Appeal decline to do. That case was binding on this court, and for the purpose of this case he adopted it."

The fact of the matter was that the law was perfectly clear. If any doubt or question at all arose, it was in ascertaining the facts in respect to the valuation; and he maintained that the general practice, taking the country throughout, was in accordance with the law.

*MR. CHAPMAN: No.

*MR. D. A. THOMAS said that that was his opinion, and he was going to endeavour to substantiate that opinion. The opinion of the Lord Chief Justice was quite sufficient for him: it laid down what the law is. He contended that outside the West Riding of Yorkshire and Lancashire the practice was in accordance with the law. What hon. members who supported this Bill desired was to bring the law into accordance with the practice of only a part of the country. He objected to the Bill on what he considered to be very substantial grounds. Large sums of money had been borrowed by local authorities upon the basis of the law as it stood, *i.e.*, where machinery was included in the valuation. He objected, also, that it removed a burden from one class only—and that a wealthy class—[Mr. CHAPMAN: "No!"]—and would place it on all other classes, some of whom, the small shop keepers and artisans, were among the poorest. The tendency, during the past half-century had been to widen the basis of local taxation, but this Bill narrowed its incidence. Again, the Bill had been brought in by a private Member, but it touched on a a very complicated question, for it was admitted that there were grievances all round in the matter of rating. He had never yet come across a ratepayer without a grievance. He urged, therefore, that the whole question of rating should be dealt with by a broad measure introduced by the Government, such as the Government had promised in the King's Speech, and not be dealt with piecemeal in this fashion. If the Bill passed it would probably create a good deal more evil than it removed, and be followed by a large crop of fresh litigation. The hon. Member for Hyde endeavoured to show that the feeling of the country supported his Bill; but so far as he could gather the feeling of the country was in an entirely opposite direction. It was only lately that the local authorities had become aware of the real meaning and intention of the Bill, and there was now quite a feeling of resentment against it.

He had attended a crowded meeting in the Westminster Palace Hotel the other day at which over fifty local authorities, some of them the most important in the country, were represented, and that meeting was unanimously against the Bill. There were only four petitions in favour of the Bill, including those presented that day, while there were seventy-eight against it—including your petitions from some of the most important local authorities in the country. He should like to give two or three illustrations of what a great effect the Bill would produce in certain localities if it were passed into law. In most parts of the country it would make a difference in the local rates of from 2d. to 6d., and in some cases of even 10d., in the £1. In West Ham the rateable value was at present about £1,250,000, and if the Bill passed there would be a reduction in the rateable value which would be equivalent to raising the rates 6d. in the £. In Swansea the rateable value was £524,000 and it was estimated that this Bill would make a difference of 20 per cent. in the rateable value there. In Sheffield it was said it would make a difference of £104,000, or 6d. in the £. on the poor rate alone. It was idle in face of such facts and figures to contend that the Bill would not injure the ratepayers. Who was going to make up the deficit? The money was not going to fall from the clouds. If one class of ratepayer was to be relieved, every other class of ratepayer must necessarily pay more. The Government were not going to make up the difference. The President of the Local Government Board last year said that he was bound to emphasise the fact that there was no intention on the part of the Government to propose now, or at any future time, that the gap left by the exemption of machinery would be filled by contributions from the Imperial Exchequer. The deficit must be made up by other classes of ratepayer.

They heard a good deal about the housing of the working classes; but, indirectly, this Bill would reduce the wages of the working classes, because if it were passed house property would have to pay more, and the working classes would have to pay either more in rent or in rates. That was an obvious consequence. It was said that the Bill was required for the sake of uniformity, but it would be perfectly easy to get uniformity now if only hon. Members who supported this Bill would see that Assessment Committees conformed to the law. Then there would be uniformity; but to ask for a change in the law because in certain parts of the country Assessment Committees refused to conform to it, seemed to him to put a premium on non-compliance with the law. It was not only on the question of the rating of machinery that there was a want of uniformity. Before the Royal Commission to which his hon. friend referred, the Secretary to the Mining Association of Great Britain said that there were two collieries in adjacent unions in Lancashire, worked under practically the same conditions, and which had practically the same value, but yet were valued on entirely different principles. There was a want of uniformity in other parts of the country also; and he thought that most hon. Members would admit that the whole question of rating required to be taken in hand by the Government and dealt with in a broad and enlightened way. A great deal had been made of the fact that the proposal in the Bill was a recommendation of the Royal Commission. One would gather from the speech of the hon. Gentleman that this was the only recommendation in the final Report of the Commission, whereas page after page of that Report was taken up with recommendations. Why select one particular recommendation? As for himself, he certainly declined to be bound by the Royal Commission. Royal Commissions were at rather a discount in these days. Moreover, even on the question of exemption the Commissioners were not consistent, for one of their recommendations was as follows—

> "We think no further extension of the principle of exemption should be permitted,"

and then promptly advised that machinery should be exempted.

A great deal had also been said with reference to the Bill which passed through this House last session relating to Scotland, but the circumstances were entirely different; and he hoped hon. Members for Scotland would give them a little Home Rule in this matter, and allow English and Welsh Members to fight out the question themselves. He thought it would be a very poor return on the part of the Scottish Members if they intervened on the present occasion. Last year the Bill was only introduced by a private Member on July 1st, and the objection of even a single Member would have upset the Bill, but it was allowed to pass without a word of discussion. Under those circumstances he thought he was entitled to ask the Scottish Members to remain neutral. The position of this Bill was entirely different. The Bill of last session was supported by the Government; it had the approval of all the Scottish Members; and the main point about it was that it proposed to bring the law into conformity with the almost universal practice in Scotland. That did not apply in the case of the present Bill. In this case the general practice was in accordance with the law as it stood. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] He maintained that the Bill which was passed last year with the approval of the Government brought the law into conformity with the practice, whereas the present Bill proposed to alter the law to bring it into conformity, not with the general practice, but with a practice which obtained in a part only of the country. He begged to move that the Bill be read that day six months.

Amendment proposed, "To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. D. A. Thomas.*)

Question proposed "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) said it would not be necessary for him to repeat the arguments laid before the House by his hon. friend. He had taken part in the discussion on this Bill for a great many years, and he could not help thinking that if there had been any general feeling throughout the country in favour of it, it would have been passed ere now. When they had an important Bill brought forward which proposed a change in the law of rating, and they were unable to get a House of forty Members for an hour after the discussion should have commenced, it was idle to argue that there was any strong feeling in any part of the House in favour of it. He agreed with the protest of his hon. friend with regard to the title of the Bill. That title had been pointed out over and over again to the promoters of the measure; but, for some reason or other, they had always refused to make any alteration in it. As a result the Bill was now known throughout the country as the Rating of Machinery Bill, but as everyone who read its contents knew perfectly well, it was simply a Bill to exempt a particular class of owners of machinery. A question had been asked as to what was the law on the subject. He understood the law to be as it was laid down in connection with the Tyne Boiler case. The North of England had always acted in accordance with that law. Undoubtedly the practice was not uniform; but although the practice was not uniform, the law was distinct, and there was no justification for a change. What did the promoters of the Bill ask for? They asked that the law should be so changed as to suit a practice which was admitted in the Court of Appeal to be irregular and improper. They in the North of England had conformed to the law, and had rated their machinery in accordance with the law as laid down in the Court of Appeal. If the Bill were to pass it would create a very great injustice throughout a great part of the country.

The case of the Scottish Bill was always quoted, but he agreed with his hon. friend that there was no analogy whatever between the two cases. The practice in Scotland was really uniform, and the decision given in the Dundee case upset that practice. That naturally was a matter of great importance, and the Bill was passed without opposition, even from Members who did not agree with the principle. He would join with his hon friend in appealing to the Scottish Members, who were left to decide their own case, to leave this matter to be settled by Englishmen alone. The Bill would be a great injustice. They borrowed money on the strength of the present law, and their municipalities had piled up large debts on the existing system. They had given the rates under the existing law as security for the money they borrowed, and if they attempted to alter the law they would lessen the value of security given to those who had advanced them money. The House should well consider before it attempted to deal with an important security of this kind; and he would appeal to Conservative Members that it was a very dangerous thing to interfere with such a security. He hoped before hon. Members voted on the Bill they would consider whether it would not be better to wait until the Government had an opportunity of dealing with the whole question.

The rateable value would be seriously increased, and the result would be that they would increase the rates of all the ratepayers in the locality. If this Bill passed it would simply mean that instead of the manufacturers having to pay the rate through their manufacturers' charges, it would have to be paid to a large extent by the workmen through increased rates and increased rent. He was glad to see that a great many manufacturers were opposing this Bill. It had always been the custom in the coal trade to tax machinery, and the mining industry of this country was more heavily taxed than any other industry, because it was not only taxed on all surface property but on the output as well. Every ton of coal produced and brought to the surface paid a tax. The product down below did not get the benefit of any rate spent upon the surface, such as the drainage or the lighting rate; yet what was the position of the mine owners with regard to this Bill? They were taxed on the output. It had now become necessary, in order to work small mines, to introduce coal-cutting machines, which were not fixed to the hereditament half so closely as these machines, and if those coal-cutting machines produced per man five tons a day instead of three, the mine owner was actually taxed on his coal-cutting machine. In fact this Bill, if passed, would create more difficulties than it was designed to remedy. He objected to it because he thought that this was a Bill which ought to be introduced by the Government only after they had investigated the whole question. They would undoubtedly increase the rates all over the country if they passed this Bill to confine the rating area of machinery.

Hon. Members opposite complained that it was a hard thing that real property should pay rates and not personal property, and they desired to bring in personal property. If that was their idea, was there anything that could better bear a rate than labour-saving machinery? If there was one class of property that should not be exempted from rating it was this class of machine that it was proposed to exempt in this Bill. He could not understand any man who had reforms at heart, wishing to introduce such a measure as this. He would rather see the area of machinery rating extended than reduced, and he could not understand why the Government should give any sanction to this Bill. He thought that they should give no sanction to a Bill of this character at all, because it would certainly interfere with a Bill which, sooner or later, they would themselves have to introduce dealing with the whole question of rating. He hoped that the Government would not allow this Bill to pass on the assumption that they themselves could do no better.

Sir WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH (Manchester, N.W.) said he thoroughly agreed with the hon. Baronet opposite that this was a matter which the Government ought to take up. On many occasions he had complained that the Government had not taken it up, and he confessed he was unable to understand their attitude on the question. This grievance went back to the year 1886, since which time fourteen Bills had been brought in by Private Members. On eight occasions a measure of this kind had passed its Second Reading with large majorities. If those majorities had dwindled in recent years it was, in his opinion, because the friends and supporters of this Bill had come to the conclusion that this was a matter for the Government to deal with, and that it ought not to be left in the hands of private Members. After the record which this Bill had he certainly thought that the Government should take it up. Besides having passed its Second Reading with great majorities, this Bill had passed through Grand Committee without any alteration, which in itself showed that there was a strong feeling in the House that this Bill should be adopted. On six occasions it had been supported, by speech and by vote, by Presidents of the Local Government Board, and, moreover, the Royal Commission on Local Taxation reported in favour of it. He did not understand how the Government could stand aloof from this Bill for England when the House was aware what facilities they had given to the Scotch measure last year. Why Scotland should be placed in such a favoured position he did not know. As the Government had given their support to the Scotch Bill he thought they had been very remiss in not dealing with this question for England.

He maintained that this Bill was in perfect harmony with the law as it had been laid down by the Lord Chief Justice. What they had to complain of was that although they did eventually get reductions they had to do so by litigation, and there was no such definition of the law in any Act of Parliament as to prevent Assessment Committees and Recorders dealing with the matter in a way which was not in accordance with the law. The House should know that there were thousands of pounds being spent every year to get justice, and to simply get the law properly applied in particular cases. He had a series of cases from different parts of the country, but he would not trouble the House with more than a general statement. They supplied instances in which the Assessment Committee proposed a rateable value which was appealed against, and they found that, after litigation costing thousands of pounds, no less than 20 per cent. and 30 per cent., and even as high as 50 per cent., was taken off the Assessment that was sought to be imposed upon the manufacturers. That was a great hardship. It was a tax on industry that they should have to go through a course of law instead of having an Act of Parliament which clearly defined what parts of the machinery were to be rated, and what parts were not to be rated. Anyone who read the Lord Chief Justice's late decision in one of their cases, a Northampton case, would see the difficulty they were placed in. The Recorder had stated a case in which the machinery was valued, and a percentage taken to represent the annual rent of the machinery. The Lord Chief Justice laid it down that this was utterly wrong, and that a separate valuation of the machinery should not be made. Yet what did the Lord Chief Justice do? He sent it back to the Recorder and said he must answer the question of the value to be put on the machinery "in his own way." The Recorder therefore was placed in this position. He was not allowed to value the machinery or take a percentage upon it, and yet in some mysterious way he was to arrive at some figure which would represent what was called the enhancement of the value of the premises. The result was that after litigation they arrived at the position that machinery practically was not rated. There was no enhancement, and the consequence was that after going through that process they got justice done.

The hon. Baronet opposite had stated that in the North of England they were carrying out the law, and that the promoters of this Bill wanted to alter the law. They did not want to alter it, but they said that it was only by litigation and an enormous expenditure, which was a tax upon industry, that they could get the law properly applied. They maintained this was a grievance which the House ought to remedy, because in Scotland and Ireland they were relieved from that difficulty, while users of machinery in England were in the position of still having that difficulty before them. The hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil had stated that there would be a very great diminution in the assessable value if this Bill was passed. He (Sir William) was sure that was not the case; he did not think there would be any great change. He had in his mind an instance where the old assessment was £156. The new assessment was £360, and it was eventually determined that £181 was the right figure, some 50 per cent. less than what was claimed by the Assessment Committee, and yet some £25 more than the old assessment. So that in the application of the law it must not be assumed that there would be any great diminution in the assessable value where machinery was not taken into account. If this Bill were passed they would get, without expense, litigation, and trouble, what they ought to get—their assessments made according to law; and if there was any district where a change of practice was involved it must be remembered that if some slight change was made there, which he did not think would be the case, there was the rest of the country, which was at present suffering under a great injustice which ought to be remedied.

He trusted that on this occasion they would not only have some sympathetic observations from the representative of the Local Government Board, but that he would feel the time had come when the Government ought to take this question up and deal with it. He knew it was said that the whole question of rating should be dealt with together. He did not object to that if there was any prospect of it. If he could only be sure that the Government would bring in a rating measure next session, embracing the whole question, including the one under discussion, and pass it through the House, he should be willing to wait another twelve months. But he hoped, as the House had expressed so often its opinion that there was a grievance and a remedy, on this occasion it would pass the second reading of the Bill and also give facilities for it being taken further than it had been in previous sessions.

Mr. URE (Linlithgowshire) said there was no denying the fact that this Bill proposed a change in the law. It was not a measure merely declaratory of, or defining, the existing law, or indeed simply laying down a rule to be followed by assessors or assessment committees. Included in real property, which was subject to rating, were fixtures, and the difficulty the Bill was designed to meet was that of saying what was, and what was not, a fixture in the sense of the Rating Acts. That was not by any means as simple a question as it at first sight appeared. In determining whether or not machinery was a fixture there were several elements to be taken into consideration, elements which were fluctuating and uncertain, such as the adaptability of the machinery for the premises in which it was placed, the nature of the attachment, whether permanent or *quasi*-permanent, the object of the attachment, and the effect that would be produced on the building itself by the removal of the machinery. There were also questions as between landlord and tenant, heir and executor, and so forth. It was a total misapprehension to suppose that the Dundee case, to which reference had been made, completely altered the law then existing in Scotland. In different parts of the country different assessors had taken different views of this knotty question. In some districts machines had been included, in others excluded, and the great struggle had always been to get excluded from the valuation the machines which a tenant would be entitled to remove at the end of his lease. Some assessors excluded altogether such machines from their valuation, a practice for which the Rating Acts gave no warrant or authority whatever.

The difficulty lay in what might be called a "no man's land" that was to be found between the two extremes. On the one hand there was the machinery which was undeniably fixed, such as was referred to in the Bill; on the other there were the loose tools which the workmen brought upon the premises, or which were in the premises and not attached in any way; but between these two extremes there was the machinery which, merely because it was essential for its use that it should be fixed and not movable, was attached by bolts and screws instead of being arrested by its own weight; that was where the difficulty came in as regarded rating. So far from the practice in Scotland having been uniform, it was extremely varying. In the Dundee case the assessor proposed to assess machinery which would have been movable had it not been essential for its use that it should be bolted and screwed into the premises, and the judges held that he was right. The Act passed last year undoubtedly made a change, if not a very material change, in the law in Scotland, and what was now proposed was to bring the law of England into line. In principle, and as a matter of experience, he believed it was a good change to make. The new rule had worked admirably in Scotland. He had not heard any complaints from his constituents as to an undue burden being imposed upon them in consequence of the change. It was most desirable that the law with regard to rating should be the same, and that there should be a uniform system throughout the United Kingdom. The industrial and economic conditions in Scotland were similar to those in England, the proportion of manufacturing concerns to mines was much the same, as also was the distribution of industries throughout the country. He therefore thought that in the interests of good local government, in which local rating was certainly included, and also in the interests of the law, which as far as possible should be uniform throughout the United Kingdom, this measure should be allowed to pass.

Mr. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) agreed that this Bill would to a certain extent alter the English law, as the Scottish Act undoubtedly altered the Scottish law. It was quite time the question of rating reform was dealt with on a broad and general basis; it ought not to be dealt with piecemeal. It had to be recognised, however, that that was somewhat of an ideal, but meanwhile, when such a measure as this, which was absolutely right in principle, had been confirmed year after year by the House of Commons, he felt that the Government ought really to take the matter in hand, at any rate as regarded this portion of the question, and carry it through. He would remind the hon. Member that in 1840 there was a most crucial alteration made in the rating law. In that year an Act was passed which provided that personalty was not to be rated in this country, and it was because that law had never been properly applied that they were now complaining that the true principle should be applied to machinery, which was in the nature of personalty. The Royal Commission, after most careful consideration of the whole question, concluded that although they would have liked to have brought personalty into rating, they were unable to lay down any fair principle upon which this could be done. He protested against taking out one class of personalty only, and applying to that a principle of rating which was not applied to any other personalty in this country or in Scotland. It was said that they could not take the burden of rating either off one individual or one class of property without imposing a burden upon some other individual or some other property. The question was in making that change were they doing a just act, and if they found someone paying an unjust burden, although by taking that burden off they might put it on to some other person, they would only be performing an act of justice by doing it. They would only be adjusting matters so that all persons would be fairly treated and placed in the same position as any other ratepayers.

The hon. Member who moved the reduction pointed out that large loans had been borrowed on the security of the rates, and he went so far as to say that under these circumstances they ought to have no reform or alteration in the rating law because they might interfere with the existing security. Would anyone in this House consent to the principle that they were never to have any change, making the rating law more just and fair, because loans had been borrowed on the security of the rates. If they were going to assent to that proposition it was no good having a Royal Commission on rating, or having discussions in this House. Simply because loans had been raised on the security of the rates was this system of rating to be stereotyped for all time? The hon. Member who seconded, referred to rating in regard to mining property. If the hon. Member would bring in any Bill on a fair basis which would make the rating of mining property more easy, fair, and just, he would promise him his support. There had been an immense amount of litigation about mining rating, and there were a great many misapprehensions as far as the rating of mining machinery was concerned. Supposing they had a mine where there was a great amount of water which necessitated a good deal of pumping machinery. That did not increase the value of the mine, because they had to produce coal under conditions where they had to make a large expenditure in order to get a proper return for the mining capital. Surely it was an immense mistake to say that because these minerals were underground that therefore the mine owners ought not to pay their fair share of the rates. How about the miners? Did they not want housing and lighting, and all those conveniences and facilities which were given at the present time by various local authorities, although at a very heavy cost to the ratepayers? He could not follow the argument of the hon. Baronet that those who worked in mines did not want the same facilities and advantages as regarded local expenditure as all other workmen in this country.

He wished now to state why he thought this Bill was right. He had already enunciated the principle that if they were not going to rate personalty generally they ought not to select a special character of personalty and place an undue burden upon it. That was the basis of the Report of the Royal Commission, who gave a chapter entirely to this subject, because it was strongly felt that there was an injustice which might be put straight apart from any general scheme. Before the year 1840 personalty was rated, but the difficulty was that as regarded machinery the decision given before 1840 had been followed ever since, although the law itself had been altered. Suppose they were to rate machinery directly, whether justly or not? It could easily be done. They could get the value of the machinery and assess it in the ordinary way. It had, however, been held to be illegal to rate machinery directly, but they might take it into account as enhancing the value of the premises on which they found machinery. That had been the difficulty, and whenever any rating authority had sought to apply this principle they had been universally overruled. That was what they wanted clearly stated in this Bill. It had been laid down that they must take into consideration the machinery as enhancing the value of the premises, and therefore it was a very illogical position. What could be more illogical or absurd than leaving the law in that state, costing thousands of pounds to get an elucidation of the principle which could not be elucidated because it was illogical. Was it not time that they should take a common-sense view and do what was proposed in this Bill? They might at least alter the law so as to lay down a definition which was both logical and could be easily applied. The hon. Member opposite had said that since they had had the Scotch Act in operation they had experienced no difficulty. Why should they deprive themselves of the simple application of a principle upon which they all agreed, to keep up a cumbrous system of this kind, which no one could understand, and which he could conceive would benefit no one but the members of his own profession. Was it contended that this state of things was to go on although this House had expressed its opinion several times upon it? He hoped this Bill would be passed by a decided majority, and he thought it was time that the Government took up a decided attitude by backing up the Report of the Royal Commission which they themselves had appointed.

*Sir WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead) said they were once again face to face with this hardy annual. He had been much struck with the lucid speech of the hon. Member for Manchester, who had placed the question upon a very fair and sensible basis. The whole of the speeches which had been delivered were practically an appeal to the Government to take this question up, and place matters upon a perfect footing. If he studied his own interests he should support this Bill, for he had to pay rates upon all the machinery in his factory. All around the north-east coast they had to pay rates upon their machinery. It was no use saying that boilers and engines only should be rated, for an engine was held down perhaps by only four bolts. The same argument applied to the shafting. Why should a planing machine or a punching machine be exempted? The judges had decided that machinery should be rated. Take, for example, an empty factory. So long as it stood empty it was not rated. Supposing a couple of young fellows started business with a small capital and rented that empty factory. He would assume that they put in an engine, a boiler, and a few machines which did not cover one-fourth of the area of the factory. They would be assessed upon that factory, although three-fourths of it was not occupied, and they would have to pay the full assessment. Was that fair? Take a shipyard as an example. The machinery used in a shipyard was practically not under cover, but in the open. Why should that machinery be exempted. There was another aspect of the question. When he tendered for a set of engines he included the labour, the material, his works charges, which included rates, taxes, insurance, and other items. After adding his profit he sent in his tender. In that case who paid his rates and taxes? Why the man who bought his goods. The whole thing was a pure matter of business.

He had not heard one single speech on the other side to inform him where the Unions were to get the money to do this work. If they were going to raise the rates of the workmen and the small tradesmen in any district they would find themselves face to face with a great issue. In poor industrial districts the hardship would be very great. Take the town of Jarrow, where the works paid one-fourth of the whole rates. How would they get the money there? It would mean an increase of 4d. in the £. in that centre, and who would have to pay the difference? Why the small tradesmen and the small shopkeepers. What would be the effect in Sunderland? In that town there would be an increase of 3d. in the £. In his own constituency of Gateshead it would mean a rate of between 4d. and 5d. in the £. He would not deal with West Ham or any of the Unions about London; but he wished to ask why the busy hives of industry should be saddled with such a large increase of rates. Therefore they were face to face with a great issue, which might develop consequences which would be far-reaching and disastrous in their effects. It behoved the House of Commons to be very thoughtful over these matters. The introducers of this measure had not told them how the money was to be got without putting increased burdens upon the working classes. He was quite ready and willing to pay rates on his machinery in order to avoid additional burdens being put upon small shopkeepers and tradesmen, and upon the working classes. Therefore he thought that this Bill ought to be thrown out, and the Government ought to take the matter up. This was a social question. They had heard from the Government expressions of sympathy with the working classes in such matters as housing and old age pensions, but why did they not take up this simple question?

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GRANT LAWSON, Yorkshire, N.R. Thirsk): Does the hon. Member mean us to take it up on the lines of this Bill or in an opposite sense?

* SIR WILLIAM ALLAN said that was not for him to say, but he wanted the Government to take it up by getting together the representatives of the different Unions, and then bring in a Bill which would be just, equitable, and righteous, and which would not put burdens on one class at the expense of another. The Government could then formulate a measure. [MINISTERIAL laughter.] Hon. Members opposite laughed, but he did not care, for he had always been treated, when he spoke, with laughter and jeers, and he had got quite accustomed to that kind of thing. [Cries of "No, no!"] This was not a laughing matter, and it ought to be taken up by the Government, and a Bill formulated after due inquiries into the whole of the circumstances, ought to be introduced. He would not follow the hon. and learned Member for Stretford in his legal argument, but he would remind him that the last time he had occasion to cross swords with him he got the better of him. He wished to put a case in point to the hon. and learned Gentleman. Supposing he possessed a pit and worked it by manual labour, and by that means produced 100 tons of coal per day. He would then be rated on an output of 100 tons of coal per day. If the hon. and learned Member introduced electrically-driven machinery he might increase his output by fifty tons per day, but then he would be rated on 150 tons. How did he get his extra fifty tons? Simply by using electrically-driven machinery. Was that not rating the machinery? By rating the output they were practically rating the machinery, and the hon. and learned Member could not get over it. The effect of this Bill was to put a tax on the worker and not on the machine, and on that ground he considered the measure to be unfair. He sincerely hoped that a representative of the Government would give the House some assurance that this question would be taken up by them, with the view to bringing to an end a dispute which had been continuous for years, and placing the whole of this rating matter on a broad and sensible basis.

SIR SAMUEL HOARE (Norwich) said his hon. friend the Member for Gateshead, if he might call him so, had suggested that the House listened to him with mockery or laughter. He could assure his hon. friend on the part of the whole House that they always listened to him with the deepest interest and pleasure, and especially when he spoke on such a subject as that now under consideration. There was a general consensus of opinion in regard to this Bill. No one who had spoken for or against the measure had suggested that the incidence of rating in different districts was carried out on a definite plan, and all had suggested that there should be, if possible, some alteration with reference to the incidence of this rate. If the law said that certain things should be rated, and if the method of assessment was different in one place from what it was in another, surely there must be a feeling of the greatest injustice where movable machinery was assessed, when the ratepayers knew that in other places it was not. The hon. Member who moved the rejection of the Bill alluded to the fact that the public bodies in the great constituency he represented were opposed to the Bill. He should have liked to ask the hon. Gentleman whether in that constituency movable machinery was assessed, and whether the members of the public bodies he alluded to were assessed for movable machinery. Much depended upon that. There was no doubt that people whose movable machinery was not rated were quite ready to leave the law as it was. They knew what had taken place in the past, but they had no insight for the future.

He represented a large and important constituency situated in a great rural district—the capital of East Anglia—where there were far greater difficulties in carrying on manufactures than in those districts whose representatives had already spoken. They were conscious in Norwich that they laboured great under disabilities, and they realised also the immense advantages the manufacturers had conferred on the city in the way of providing employment for a large body of the working classes. He was sorry to hear the hon. Member for Gateshead suggest that those who supported the Bill did not think of the interests of the working classes. It was because he was deeply interested in those classes that he believed new legislation was absolutely necessary in order to avert a diminution, possibly a large diminution, in our manufactures. This large diminution of employment for the working classes would mean greater burdens on the rates. He had received an interesting letter signed by a large number of the leading citizens of Norwich, in which they complained of the uncertainty of the law with respect to rating of machinery, owing to the different interpretations given in different districts, and stating that legislation ought to be such as to help and not to hinder manufacturers. The hon. Member for Gateshead said he believed that the decisions of the Court supported the view he had put before the House. The experience in Norwich was very different. For instance, in the case of J. Skelton and Sons, the Norwich Quarter Sessions reduced an assessment from £240 to £155—a reduction of 35 per cent. In other cases there had been reductions of 25 per cent. He asked the House to consider what that meant. It meant very costly litigation, and worse than that was the state of irritation caused in the place, which was not at all desirable in a community. It was evident that some alteration in the law was necessary when uncertainty existed as at the present time.

What was going to be the result of this assessment of machinery if it continued in a place like Norwich? He had seen statements in print that one of their large manufacturers, instead of enlarging his premises within the city, was contemplating moving. He had heard remarks in regard to others who contemplated a similar course. Could anything be worse than that manufacturers should be driven away into the country hard by where their moveable machinery would not be rated? It was said that this was a manufacturers' Bill. Only last year he held in his hand fifteen memorials from working people employed in large manufactures in favour of the measure then before the House. It was scarcely right to say that the Bill came from one section of the community or another. He at least could speak for manufacturers and those whom they employed, for he had had any number of letters and memorials from both, and they all pointed in one direction. He appealed to the Government to take this matter up. It was not fair at present that manufacturers in Norwich should be assessed for moveable machinery, while in many neighbouring places those who competed with them, under the greatest advantages, were not assessed. He spoke for one important centre, and he knew how serious would be the loss if their manufactures were in any way interfered with, not only to the manufacturers but also to the thousands of employees who were dependent on them. He would vote for the Second Reading of the Bill.

MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.) said he trusted the speech of the hon. Member for Norwich would remove one consideration operating against the Bill which had undoubtedly impressed several hon. Members who had spoken. The hon. Baronet referred to the interest which the working class had in this matter. It was suggested by his hon. friend the Member for Gateshead that the industrial interests of the labouring class would be injuriously affected by the operation of this measure. He thought the hon. Baronet had entirely disposed of that argument. The working class had no less an interest in the industry, the output of which was the fund from which their wages were derived, than the capitalist whose capital was employed in carrying on that industry. Therefore, by relieving the burden which rested on a manufacturing industry they conferred a benefit, not only upon the capitalist, but also upon the industrial class who had a joint interest in a common concern. He had the honour to represent a constituency which was as largely concerned in manufacturing enterprise as any constituency in the United Kingdom, and therefore in regard to this measure he thought it was one's duty to look at it from the point of view of those who were engaged in conducting very large manufacturing enterprises.

He would ask the attention of the House for a moment to the arguments which had been brought to one's mind by the officials engaged in collecting and administering the rates derived from property on the present basis of rate valuation. He had no doubt that many hon. Members had been memorialised by Boards of Guardians in regard to this matter. His hon. friend the Member for Gateshead had pointed out that any relief given in the direction indicated would cast some increased corresponding burden on other sections of the community. That was no doubt an important practical consideration, but they were discussing whether or not the law should remain as it was now, while waiting for the long-delayed measure of the Government to put rating on some logical and intelligible basis. He had felt the force of that argument. The answer to it seemed to him to be this. In the first place, there was no reason to believe that the result of this Bill would be as great as was apprehended by the local authorities who were charged with the collection and administration of the existing rates. In the second place, the question was not how the law of rating in regard to this class of property was ultimately to stand; the question was how they were to deal with it in the interim before fresh legislation was carried in reference to this matter. Surely it was important to secure that the administration of the law should be in harmony with the principles of the law, and that, before the new legislation was to operate, they should have taken some steps to prevent errors in the administration of that branch of the law which it was proposed to reform.

The argument for this Bill was that the valuation in regard to this property was erroneous and unequal, and that these errors and inequalities should be corrected without delay, so that when new legislation was introduced it might operate on a system which was uniform, and which was in conformity with legal principle. The legal principle could be stated in a sentence. The property which should be rated was the fabric, *plus* the landlord's equipment. The tenant's outfit should not be rated. The terms were so vague at present that the law was applied differently in different districts. It had one application on the Clyde in connection with the shipbuilding industry, and another application on the Tyne, so that, in the competition for orders, an advantage was given to the Clyde shipbuilders over those of the Tyne. It was important that the House should make it perfectly clear how the rule was to receive practical and every-day application. The hon. Member for Gateshead said that machinery ought to be rated, and that that was the law. But he should like to know how the hon. Member would apply the rule. He supposed the hon. Member would not rate a smith's hammer, but he would rate a steam hammer. Mere considerations of size and position ought not to make all the difference between the inclusion or non-inclusion for rating purposes of these articles. He only indicated this to show the great difficulty of the problem. He thought the Bill sought to make the law harmonious and intelligible, and he would support it.

*MR. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said the effect of the Bill would be very different in different areas. In agricultural Unions it would have the effect of throwing a greater burden upon agricultural land, but in Unions in textile districts, comprising a great deal of textile machinery, it would have little or no effect, because in these Unions it had been the custom not to rate machinery hitherto. In Unions where there was a great deal of heavy, non-textile machinery the effect of the Bill would be simply disastrous. The hon. Baronet the Member for Central Manchester said he did not think the Bill would reduce the assessable value in any given area to any appreciable extent, but it could be demonstrated that it must have that effect. He instanced the case of Sheffield, particularly the division which he represented, and stated that in it there were large iron and steel works of all sorts. Those works contained heavy and costly machinery not attached to the hereditaments in such a way that any part of the premises would have to be destroyed if the machinery was moved. It was placed on the ground and secured by bolts to a concrete foundation, but the whole of it could be taken away without in any way injuring the premises. The total rateable value of the works in Brightside was a little over £130,000, but land and buildings only represented £50,000, motive power £10,000, and machinery, which the Bill would exempt, no less than £70,000, so that the assessable value of the whole of these works would be decreased by more than one half. Moreover, the total rateable value of the whole of that part of the Union would be decreased by some 20 per cent. That was a more extreme case than prevailed in the Sheffield Union as a whole. But, even so, the effect of the Bill in that Union would be to send up the poor rate alone by 6d. in the £. The difficulty in such a case was this—if they exempted machinery, where were they going to get the money from? Practically the only rateable property available would be that belonging to the railway companies and small house property. He quite understood the difficulty felt in certain industries, but the question, if it was to be touched, ought to be dealt with as a whole, and the burden should be defrayed by further subventions from the fuller pocket of the taxpayers rather than by the ratepayers.

The Bill also bore on the housing question. The great difficulty of the housing question in towns was to have houses which could be let at a rent which the poorest class of the population could pay, and which would yet give a return—a very narrow return, but still, such a return as would enable the municipality to pay the interest on the loans that it had to raise for that purpose. The margin of profit or loss was an exceptionally small one, and if they put a greater burden on the one class of property, which they ought to treat lightly—he meant the small house property—the difficulty, already great, would be insuperable. Was it worth the while of his textile friends to get their way at such a very great cost as this Bill would involve to others? Even if they thought they must attain their object, he would ask them to look at it in the light that, as against prospective grievances on the one hand, they would be creating real, substantial grievances on the other. He would ask his friends engaged in manufacture, whether it was possible that they would ultimately derive great profit from such a Bill as this, because, the greater burden they put on house property must fall on rent, and rent would react on wages. Immediate and temporary profit would be got at a very heavy cost to the poorer class of ratepayers. He would be bound to oppose that Bill.

MR. BARRAN (Leeds, N.) said he wished to support the Bill as the representative of a city much interested in trade and manufactures. As the hon. Member for Brightside had pointed out, it was not that they were suffering at the present time from rating, but there was an immediate fear of having their machinery rated in the future, and that was a question of vital importance to all the industries of Leeds. Every year the value of machinery put up was greater, and, at the same time, the life of that machinery was in many cases shorter than before. On account of changes in the trade it was absolutely necessary for manufacturers from time to time to throw out very valuable machinery, simply because it had become obsolete, and replace it with machinery of a much newer pattern. If that machinery were rated they would be put to great disadvantages in foreign competition. One effect of the machinery of modern type was that a larger amount of work was turned out, especially in the textile trade, and the goods were sold at a smaller rate of profit. Any burden or expense imposed before these small profits were realised would hamper them in the markets of the world. That was the reason why they, in the manufacturing districts, wished to keep the rates down to the smallest possible amount. The hon. Member for Gateshead had remarked that the buyers paid the rates. He did not agree with that. If there was a large retail business, with a turnover of £100,000 a year, the merchant was rated only on the value of the building, and why should a manufacturer be rated, not only on the value of his premises, but on the added value of very expensive machinery? He maintained that that was a great injustice to manufacturers, who, after all, were a more important factor in the country than the merchants. He held that this was a tax put on before the manufacturers' profits were made, and it ought to be a tax after these profits were made. There was a movement, with some force behind it, for rating machinery right through the north of England. The textile districts in Yorkshire and Lancashire were thus in danger of having their success in the open markets of the world seriously interfered with, and it was therefore of urgent importance that some legislation of the kind represented by this Bill should be carried at once.

SIR JOHN ROLLESTON (Leicester) said as representing a manufacturing district of considerable size and importance he had had many representations made to him on this subject from Chambers of Commerce, and the organisations of various trades. Although he was not a manufacturer himself he was of opinion that the Bill would simplify and define the law, possibly prevent litigation, and remove a disability from the industries of the country. He had a petition signed by 120 firms asking him to induce the Government to grant facilities for the advancement of this most important commercial measure, and to support its Second Reading. He hoped the Government would help the Bill forward through its subsequent stages, so that the great working centres of the country might have the advantage of it before the close of the year.

*MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid.) said he was not a lawyer and therefore could not enter into a lawyer-like exposition of this rating question; he simply looked at it from a working man's point of view. The hon. Member for Norwich had supported the Bill, but he spoke simply as a Member of Parliament, because representatives of the Norwich Union who were present at the great meeting at Westminster Palace Hotel on Wednesday—men who were better able to gauge the public opinion of the district —were opposed to the Bill, and showed that if machinery was exempted from rating the effect would be to throw a very considerable charge on other classes of property. He also thought that the hon. and learned Member for Stretford had, of course unintentionally, done some injustice to the hon. Member for Chester-le-Street, whose contention was that the effective protective work in mines had no bearing whatever on the subject matter of the Bill. There had been some talk about uniformity in rating, but any uniformity that was to be acquired by the sacrifice of justice was not a thing to be desired. If this class of machinery was relieved from the burden of the rates upon whose shoulders would that burden fall, and who would be the largest sufferers from it? That was a question which did not require humorous but serious legislative attention on the part of the Government. He was surprised that no indication had been given of what their intention was in regard to a measure promised in the King's Speech, and he hoped that the hon. Gentleman who represented the Government would give this before the close of the debate. If the hon. Gentleman had given before now such an indication there was no doubt the promoters of the Bill would have removed it from the purview of the House. The hon. Member who introduced the Bill tried to be a little poetic about bees and honey.

*MR. CHAPMAN said that what he had stated was that they should tax the honey when it was made, but not tax the bees when they were making it.

* MR. WILSON said that poetry was really too deep for him. He wanted to put the matter from a working man's point of view. There had been many expressions of sympathy with the working men, who were no doubt very grateful for such. But the exemption of this class of machinery would lessen the rateable value of every district, and therefore lessen the assets, leaving the liabilities the same. Upon what other class would they impose the necessary rating, or would they rate all the remaining classes alike regardless of the effect it would have on the welfare of the people of the district? The question for the House then, was, upon whose shoulders would fall the burden of the rates which this Bill proposed should be shifted, and would the people of the district have to bear a larger share of the burden of the rates than they did now? He had presented a petition that day from one of the most important County Councils in the country, that of Durham, of which he was vice chairman, and he ventured to say that the unanimous opinion of that County Council was against the Bill. If the rating on machinery was removed the money could only come from the additional rating of house property in the neighbourhood. There were, therefore, no classes from whom to get the money except either the shopkeepers or the working men. To get it from the working men by making them pay more money on their houses would restrict their accommodation by forcing them into smaller houses. If the shopkeepers had to pay increased rates they would recoup themselves by charging higher prices for their commodities. So that either directly or indirectly the working men would suffer.

It was said that the employers relieved from this class of rating would give their workmen a return in higher wages. With all deference to the employers in this House, he was not the man to believe that with simplicity, or that wages would rise automatically in proportion to the relief from rates which might be granted to the employers. On the contrary, he believed that there was yet a large remnant of a tacit understanding among employers to press down wages wherever that could be done, and therefore he did not believe that if the employers were relieved from the rating they would increase wages. The hon. Gentleman who moved the Second Reading of the Bill spoke of the multitude of working men who were in its favour. That was a very indefinite term; and he ventured to say that there had never been a general conference of working men at which this question had been discussed where an expression of opinion had been given in favour of the Bill. He himself could not at all see how the working classes of the country could be benefited by the Bill. They were all representatives of Labour now; but he thought it necessary, as a representative of the working classes of the country, to put before the House what he considered would be their view of this question, and what the effect of this Bill would be on the working classes in these districts where the machinery referred to was in use.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said he had not been present throughout the debate, as, when he arrived punctually, he found that so little interest was taken in the Bill by its promoters that it was impossible to proceed. He had, however, been present for some hours, and it struck him as rather a significant fact that during that time he had not heard a single representative of a rural constituency take part in the debate. It had been almost entirely a squabble between lawyers and practical men, or between urban representatives. He was not about to enter into the dangerous possibility of arguing with a lawyer, but he had been very much struck with some of the leading arguments that had been adduced. One of his hon. and learned friends said that the general incidence of the law of rating as to personalty was unjust and unsatisfactory, and that, therefore, this particular injustice should be removed. But surely that was a very quibbling argument. If this one specimen of injustice alone were to be removed, was it not much more necessary to remove larger and more glaring injustices which attached to the law of rating personalty? He could not quite see that that legal argument was sound, and that this Bill was justified because it would touch one single sore point in a great measure of injustice. He was also struck by the direct divergence of opinion between the representatives of the larger urban districts. There was a friendly duel between the hon. Member who represented Gateshead and his hon. friend the Member for Norwich. There could not be a more divergent statement of the case than was made by the hon. Member on the one side and his hon. friend on the other. He was rather struck by some of the arguments of his hon. friend. His hon. friend gave the House an interesting statement of his experience as to the good effect of a small minor industry he had started; but it struck him that that good effect had been arrived at under the existing law, and under the pressure of this grave abuse, which his hon. friend now wished to remove. Therefore the industry did not suffer very much. Then he was very much struck by what his hon. friend said about an arrangement by which machinery was not rated outside Norwich, whereas it was rated inside Norwich, and his hon. friend deplored the possibility of a factory being removed from Norwich into a rural distict. Why should not a rural district get the advantage of that change?

SIR SAMUEL HOARE said the industry to which he referred escaped this particular charge because it was outside Norwich. He was, however, concerned for the large number of people that might be left in the city without employment, which would be very serious for the city, if factories were removed.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said it might be very serious for the city, but it would be advantageous to the country; and he was not prepared to accept an argument based on an advantage to a city and a disadvantage to country districts. Another point which was not alluded to during the debate was the general attitude of rural authorities on this matter. He believed that public bodies representing rural districts were fairly unanimous against this Bill; all the public expressions of opinion sent to him were against it; and all the various authorities from whom he drew his opinion were also against it. Therefore, he did not think that it was quite fair that the House should proceed to a division without recognising that, whatever might be the attitude of the urban districts in connection with the Bill—and they appeared to be equally divided—the rural districts were opposed to it. Of course, it would not affect the rural districts in the degree that it would affect the urban districts; and it was quite true that the Agricultural Rating Act, which was an extremely beneficial and excellent Act, which hon. Gentlemen opposite wished to repeal, would minimise the mischief of this measure to a certain degree; there remained a certain number of arguments not so serious in the country as in the towns, but yet sufficiently serious to induce the country districts to oppose this measure. If the Bill were carried it would mean a larger burden of rates; they think it is not fair that one class, and one class, only should be relieved; and they consider that the demand which was now laid on the whole community should continue to be laid on the whole community until a larger and more comprehensive measure was brought forward.

He was also struck by the curious contest of argument as to whether this measure would really prove to be advantageous to the manufacturer at all. They were told on authority, which they should accept as good, that the whole extra cost involved in the rating of machinery would be absolutely secured between the seller of machinery and the buyer. Representatives of the rural constituencies ought to be in the position of holding the balance between the conflicting opinions of urban representatives—between the squabbling giants of industry. If the rural representatives were to decide the question, both parties would, at all events, be sent back until they had arrived at an agreement in the matter. The present appeared to him to be the most unfortunate time that could possibly be chosen for urging this measure. They hoped and believed that in another session Parliament would be invited to deal with the whole question of local taxation. Why, therefore, should they not wait until that time arrived, and leave this subsidiary point to be dealt with as part and parcel of the larger measure. From a rural point of view, what time can be more unfortunate than the present for passing this Bill?

They had before them the certainty of extra rates, which would have to be imposed to carry out the provisions of the Education Act; and yet at this moment when rural constituencies were uneasy, certain hon. Gentlemen seemed to think it was the right time to still further increase the rates. He could not conceive a more inopportune or unwise time to choose for urging such a measure. He, of course, identified himself with all that had been said about the desirability of dealing with the local taxation question as soon as possible. They had reason to believe that it was going to be dealt with, and he would urge on his hon. friends who had an open mind still on the subject, that there were many excellent reasons for abstaining from voting for this measure. As a representative of a rural constituency he would vote against the Bill, because, as he understood them, its provisions would not act fairly or squarely; because the rural constituencies did not want to have this Bill forced upon them; but principally because he thought it was a most inopportune and unwise time to raise this question.

MR. HUMPHREYS OWEN (Montgomeryshire) said that as the representative of a predominantly agricultural constituency, he wished to join in what had been said by his hon. and gallant friend in condemnation of this Bill. It was admitted that the incidence of rating as between realty and personalty was thoroughly unsatisfactory. It was also admitted that an attempt had been made by various subventions to meet these defects. As far as he understood, however, the main object of the Bill was to clear away some ambiguity in the administration of the law of rating, by imposing a great injustice on one class of ratepayer as against another class. It had been pointed out over and over again that this was simply a question of shifting the incidence of the rates. If the owners of machinery were relieved from rates which they paid at present, nothing whatever was done to relieve the general burden of the rates: all they did was to transfer the rates from one set of people who had been paying them to another set. The relief which had been given to agriculturists would be taken away from them at the very moment when it was absolutely necessary for the successful prosecution of that industry. They had had many arguments as to the difficulty which the rating of machinery imposed on manufacturers. He agreed that any imposition on machinery was bad in principle. It diminished products, impaired trade, and played into the hands of their commercial rivals. But that was not a reason for transferring the burden from one class of manufacturer, the manufacturer of bread and meat, to another class of manufacturer, and from a class of manufacturer who, at all events, appeared on the surface to be prosperous to another class of manufacturer who it was admitted shared less in the national prosperity than any other. They were told that the working classes would suffer in consequence; but that was an argument for reducing expenditure, not an argument for transferring the burden.

They had heard from his hon. friend the Member for Norwich that there were great complaints as to the incidence of rates on machinery. He had a copy of the letter from which his hon. friend read an extract; and it simply came to this, that the assessment committee in Norwich seemed to have failed in doing its duty. It proposed an extravagant assessment on manufacturers; and when the latter appealed, the Recorder brought down the assessment to a reasonable sum. His hon. friend complained of the cost of appealing. Of course appeals cost money, but that was an argument for improving the procedure in rating appeals. It was by no means an argument for altering the law to the disadvantage of one class of ratepayer against another. His hon. friend pointed out that the village industry in which he was interested did not suffer, because it was outside Norwich; but that had nothing to do with the question of the rating of machinery. The law of rating was the same in Norwich as in Norfolk; all that happened was that the rates were lower in the villages than in the city. The law of rating was unsatisfactory; but to propose a partial reform now instead of a general scheme would only increase the difficulties of the position.

No doubt some alteration in the law as to the rating of machinery was likely; but until they could get a complete reform of the law of rating, it was most undesirable that they should make an alteration which would satisfy only a very small interest, and increase the feeling of injustice which existed in both town and country.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GRANT LAWSON, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) said he had been appealed to by the supporters of the Bill, without distinction of Party, to say that the Government would bring in a Bill to carry out the principle suggested in this measure. On the other hand, he had been appealed to by the opponents of the Bill, without distinction of Party, to say that the Government would bring in a Bill to carry out a diametrically opposite principle. He was sure his hon. friend would forgive him if, in that state of perplexity, he asked the hon. Gentleman the Member for Gateshead to explain his position. He would have been in a position of some difficulty, were it not for the fact, commented on several times during the afternoon, that this Bill presented itself to their notice with the regularity of a recurring decimal. That gave him a great many precedents from speeches by Presidents of the Local Government Board of both Parties for the course he ought to adopt. All the precedents tended in the same direction. It had been the invariable practice of successive Governments to leave this matter entirely to the free and open choice of the House, untrammelled by even the semblance of Party allegiance, or by that desire to support the Government which was such a conspicuous feature of the Party system of the present day. There seemed to him to be excellent ground for the attitude of neutrality adopted by various Governments. A matter of this sort was not capable of having any Party interpretation placed upon it. The most prejudiced partisan could not impart into its discussion any question of Party principle. Indeed, the combination of names on the back of the Bill, which were drawn with admirable impartiality from both sides of the House, showed that this was not a Party question in which the Government, as a Government, should hold a solid united opinion. Nor could any definite pronouncement on this matter be demanded from the Government on account of the Imperial or national importance of the question. Some parts of the country would not be affected if the Bill were passed; in many parts the effect would be entirely insignificant; in other parts the effect would be different. Where this machinery had already been taken into consideration in rating hereditaments, it would remove a part, whether great or small, of the local burden from one set of shoulders to another set; where the machinery was not taken into consideration the effect would be to prevent the possibility of those who did not use machinery ever shifting on to those who did, the burden imposed by law on the present users of machinery. This was a matter as between different sets of ratepayers; but it was not a national matter in which the Government, as a Government, should be called upon to give a definite pronouncement.

It was obvions he was speaking with no mandate from the Government for or against the Bill; but he had now reached a point on which he could speak with some authority. The amount of rateable value attributed to this machinery, which it is proposed to exempt, must be considerable, or else no such strong feeling would exist among the rating authorities, who carried out the law, against the measure. That being the case, if the Bill were passed there would be a very considerable reduction in the assessable value of the districts concerned. He had authority to say that the Government were not prepared to fill up the gap so made in those localities from the National Exchequer. It might be said, as was said last year, that that was done in the case of the Agricultural Rating Act. It was; but he differentiated that case from this case. Had the Government not supplied the deficit caused by that Act from Imperial sources, there would have been, in many parts of the country, no pockets in the rating area from which the deficit could be supplied, except the pockets of the men whom it was sought to relieve, which would neutralise the effect of the Act. That certainly would not carry out the desire of the Government to help agriculture. That was all he could say on behalf of the Government; but perhaps the House would bear with him for a few moments as one who had sat throughout the debates on the subject for many years.

SIR JAMES JOICEY asked what about the Government Bill.

MR. GRANT LAWSON said he had already explained that he had no authority to state whether the Government intended to bring in a Bill to meet the views of either the supporters or the opponents of the Bill.

SIR JAMES JOICEY said that in the King's Speech there was a promise of a Bill dealing with the whole question of rating. What he should like to ask was, whether it would not be wiser to leave a small matter of this kind until the Government brought in its Bill on the whole subject.

MR. GRANT LAWSON said that was a matter which his right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board dealt w th on the reading of this Bill last year. He then indicated that the direction which the Government Bill would take would be an alteration more of the authority for valuation than an alteration in the direction given to that authority. There were one or two points on which they should have some help from those who had gone into the figures. One curious point in the debates on this Bill was that though the discussion was of a financial character, figures were carefully excluded. They were not told whether, for instance, the people who would be relieved under this Bill claimed, or did not claim, to have less capacity to pay rates than those who used heavy machinery. No one went into the point as to whether the user of heavy machinery derived more, or less, advantage from the expenditure of the rates than the user of light machinery. Every rating consideration ought to turn on the capacity to pay, and the benefit received; but those considerations had never yet entered into a discussion of the Rating of Machinery Bill. They were told that different methods of assessment were adopted in different parts of the country; but they never had any figures to show what the actual result was. Could any hon. Member tell the House whether a mill, in all respects equal, would be rated more highly in Gateshead than in Manchester, or more highly in Scotland than in Gateshead.

The character of the opposition to the Bill had greatly changed. He remembered that it used to be the distressed agriculturist who raised his solitary voice against it, and he confessed that with him he always had the greatest sympathy, because although there might not be any machinery in his particular parish which might be rated, he had a great interest in the county rate, and there might be machinery in other parishes, which, if exempted from rating would increase the burden upon him. That was the state of things in the past, but a great deal of that evil had been remedied by the passing of the Agricultural Rating Act, by which many of these objections had been got rid of. This Bill used only to be opposed by the north-east districts, but now when the list of petitions was seen, it was found that the objection was becoming very widespread, but in considering those objections one fact could not be got over, and that was that the Royal Commission had voted dead in favour of this Bill. That was a fact he hoped the House would not lose sight of.

Another fact had been alluded to which he thought should also be borne in mind. The hon. Member had spoken of the majorities by which this Bill had been passed. He recollected on one occasion it was passed unanimously owing to the proposer and the seconder of the measure only being present, and there being nobody else in the House. With regard to the majorities in 1893, the figures reached high water mark. The majority then was 153; in 1894 it was ninety-one; in 1895 it was fifty-one; then came an interval while the Royal Commission on Rating was sitting. That Commission reported in favour of the Bill, and last year the Bill was carried by a majority only of thirty-five. Those figures did not show that the Bill was growing in popular favour, or that it was one that the Government should take up. It had been said that this Bill if carried would prevent litigation, but his experience had been that every Act of Parliament brought forward had the contrary effect; it did not prevent but encouraged litigation. Parliament made the law, and the lawyers made what they could out of the law which Parliament made. The matter had been thrashed out in Court after Court. The law had been interpreted by the Court of Appeal, which was the only authority which could interpret the law, and if the law was now altered all the various sets of interpretations would be upset, and he could imagine some very nice legal points arising, and it seemed to him that any one who imagined litigation would be reduced by this Bill would be doomed to grievous disappointment.

MR. GROVES (Salford, S.) said if any argument were needed to show the necessity of a measure of this kind, it was the extreme diversity of opinion shown by the two hon. Gentlemen representing such closely connected manufacturing districts as Sheffield and Leeds. The hon. Member for Sheffield was an opponent to the Bill, because he conceives that the transference of the rate from the machinery user to the small holder, would be detrimental to his constituents, while, on the other hand, the hon. Member for Leeds was in favour of the Bill which he believed would confer a benefit on his constituents. A man who had a dwelling house for which he paid a rent, was not rated on the furniture he put into that house, whether it was fixed or removable, and he failed to see why a manufacturer should be rated for movable articles of machinery which were his own private property, and on which he would escape assessment in the town immediately adjoining his own. The Royal Commission had reported in favour of this Bill, and although it was possible that a matter of this kind could be dealt with in the future, there were certain matters on which this country demanded immediate legislation.

*MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said that so much had been said as to the Royal Commission reporting in favour of this Bill that he wished to state that the Royal Commission, when they approved the principles of this Bill, were approving at the same time in principle a great many other matters for the reform of local taxation. He deprecated the extraction of a single one of the proposals of the Report from the rest in his way, and he personally should vote against this Bill.

*MR. HENRY WILSON (York, W.R., Holmfirth) said the promoters of the Bill assured its opponents that it would not affect heavy machinery, which in many places is rated already, but he asked how they were going to discriminate between heavy machinery and light machinery; the only difference was that heavy machinery was fastened down with a heavy bolt and light machinery with a light one, and no distinction could be made on that ground. The practical effect of this Bill, if passed, would be that the rates of the community at large, including small householders, would in some parts of Sheffield be raised as much as 10d. in the £; and he thought it would be a hardship if manufacturers who were doing well under the present system were relieved of a large sum which would have to be distributed over the other ratepayers. He reminded the House that the Corporation of Sheffield, and the Guardians of the Poor, had petitioned against the Bill, which had also been condemned by the Trades Council.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) said he wanted to know who was going to pay the deficiency when it arose. Were those who introduced machinery into their manufactories going to escape the responsibilities it brought with it, and throw the burden upon the unfortunate people who had been displaced by the introduction of the machinery? The hon. Gentleman who represented the Government had told the House that the Government would not meet that deficiency, and therefore, so far as he could see, the burden must fall upon the work people who, first of all having been displaced by the introduction of machinery, would have to pay the extra rates. In those circumstances he could not understand how any one representing a working class constituency could support this Bill. As a working man himself, and as a representative of working men, he should vote against it.

Mr. CREAN (Cork, S. E.) who spoke amid continuous interruptions and cries of "Divide," was understood to say there was no doubt that this was an attempt to relieve a certain class of ratepayers who could well afford to pay, and to throw the burden upon a class which could not. From time to time the rates increased owing to the improved conditions of life, and he thought that the House should endeavour to broaden the area of taxation rather than narrow it. If they took this rate off machinery and placed it on the small householders they would be doing a most unfair thing, and that being so he should support the Amendment.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 157; Noes, 119. (Division List No. 38.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther, H. T.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbt. Hy.

Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (*Leeds*
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Black, Alexander William
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Bull, William James

Caldwell, James
Campbell, Rt Hn J A (*Glasg.*)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish, R. F. (*N. Lancs.*)
Cavendish, V C W (*Derbysh.*)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Channing, Francis Allston
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Craig, Robert Hunter (*Lanark*)
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crombie, John William
Cross, H. Shepherd (*Bolton*)
Crossley, Sir Savile

Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Jos. C.
Duke, Henry Edward
Dunn, Sir William
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart

Elibank, Master of

Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (*Leith*
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (*Man'r*
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Philip S. *Warwick, S. W.*
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*

Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H (*City of Lond*
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gray, Ernest (*West Ham*)
Greene, Sir E. W. (*Bury St. Ed.*
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hatch, Ernest Frederick G.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt Hon Sir Arthur D.
Heath, James (*Staffords. N. W.*)
Helme, Norval Watson
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, J. (*Midd., Tott'ham*
Hudson, George Bickersteth

Johnstone, Heywood

Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (*Monm'th*)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lees, Sir Joseph F. (*Accrington*)
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee

M'Arthur, Charles (*Liverpool*)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benj.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mitchell, William
Morgan, D. J. (*Walthamstow*)
Morrell, George Herbert

Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian

Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay

Partington, Oswald
Peel, Hn. Wm. R. Wellesley
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert

Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Rea, Russell
Reid, James (*Greenock*)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (*Dumfries*
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (*Stalybridge*
Ridley, S. F. (*Bethnal Green*)
Rigg, Richard
Robertson, H. (*Hackney*)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Runciman, Walter

Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry

Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, John (*Forfarshire*)
Smith, Jas. Parker (*Lanarks.*)
Smith, Samuel (*Flint*)
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Strachey, Sir Edward

Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. *Ox'd Univ.*
Taylor, Austin (*East Toxteth*)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, F. Freeman-(*Hastings*
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomkinson, James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. E. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty

Ure, Alexander

Valentia, Viscount

Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Walton, J. Lawson (*Leeds, S.*)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Wason, E. (*Clackmannan*)
Wason, J. Cathcart (*Orkney*)
White, George (*Norfolk*)
Whiteley, G. (*York, W. R.*)
Whiteley, H. (*Ashton-u.-Lyne*)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. S. (*York, E. R.*)
Wilson John (*Glasgow*)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (*Bath*
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Woodhouse, Sir J T (*Huddersf'd*

Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Chapman and Mr. Emmott.

NOES.

Abraham, W. (*Cork, N.E.*)
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Allan, Sir William (*Gateshead*)

Bain, Colonel James Robert
Barry, E. (*Cork, S.*)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boland, John
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (*Middx.*)
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles

Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (*Armagh, S.*)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cecil, Evelyn (*Aston Manor*)
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William

Davies, M. Vaughan-(*Cardigan*
Delany, William
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.

Edwards, Frank
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas

Ffrench, Peter
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Furness, Sir Christopher

Gilhooly, James
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Gore, HnG. R. C. Ormsby-(*Salop*
Grant, Corrie
Greene, W. Raymond- (*Cambs*
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guthrie, Walter Murray

Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hayden, John Patrick
Hemphill, Rt. Hon Chas. H.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (*Sheffield, Brightside*
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.

Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David B. (*Swansea*)
Jones, Wm. (*Carnarvonshire*)

Kennedy, Patrick James

Labouchere, Henry
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Law, H. Alex. (*Donegal, W.*)
Lawson, John Grant
Lockie, John
Lucas, Reg'ld J. (*Portsmouth*)
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
M'Arthur, William (*Cornwall*)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Montagu, G. (*Huntingdon*)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (*Hants.*)
Mooney, John J.

Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (*Louth, S.*)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William

O'Brien, James F. X. (*Cork*)
O'Brien, K. (*Tipperary, Mid*)
O'Brien, Patrick (*Kilkenny*)
O'Brien, P. J. *Tipperary, N.*)
O'Connor, Jas. (*Wicklow, W.*)
O'Kelly, Conor (*Mayo, N.*)
O'Kelly, J. (*Roscommon, N.*)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Palmer, Sir C. M. (*Durham*)
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Pickard, Benjamin
Power, Patrick Joseph
Pretyman, Ernest George
Priestley, Arthur

Reddy, M.
Redmond, Jn. E. (*Waterford*)
Redmond, William (*Clare*)
Remnant, Jas. Farquharson
Renwick, George
Robinson, Brooke
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose, Charles Day
Round, Rt. Hon. James

Sadler, Col. Saml. Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (*Limehouse*)
Samuel, Herbt. L. (*Cleveland*)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, HC (*North'mb, Tyneside*
Stanley, Hon. A. (*Ormskirk*)
Sullivan, Donal

Talbot, Lord E. (*Chichester*)
Thomas, J. A. (*Glam., Gower*)

Walton, Joseph (*Barnsley*)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, H. J. (*York, W. R.*)
Wilson, John (*Durham, Mid*)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart

Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. D. A. Thomas and Colonel Kenyon-Slaney.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Friday 15th May.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 23rd March, 1903.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Bill [H.L.]; a witness ordered to attend the Select Committee.

Macclesfield and District Electric Tramways Bill [H.L.]; read 2ª (according to order).

South Staffordshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Hove, Worthing, and District Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Chatham and District Light Railways Bill [H.L.]; Mid Yorkshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; committed: the Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

South Lancashire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Preston and Horwich Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Southern Tramways (Lancashire) Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Southern Tramways (Cheshire) Bill [H.L.]; Derby Gas Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Bill [H.L.]; North Cheshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; committed: the Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Shepshed Urban District Gas Bill [H.L.]; committed.

Plymouth and Stonehouse Gas Bill [H.L.]; reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Cleveland and Durham County Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 12th instant discharged; and Bill committed for Thursday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOAN FUND BOARD OF IRELAND.

Sixty-fifth Annual Report, 1902: Presented [by command], and ordered to lie on the Table.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury Minute, dated 18th March, 1903, declaring that William Barber, artificer, Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his department. Laid before the House [pursuant to Act], and ordered to lie on the Table.

BRIDLINGTON PIERS AND HARBOUR.

Abstract of the Annual General Account, for the year ended 26th July, 1902. Delivered [pursuant to Act], and ordered to lie on the Table.

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION FOR THE STANDING COMMITTEE.

Report from, That the Committee have nominated the following Lords to serve as Chairmen of the Standing Committee:

E. Spencer.
E. Morley.
E. Camperdown.
V. Cross.
L. Balfour.
L. Elgin (*E. Elgin and Kincardine*).
L. Burghclere.

Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

STANDING COMMITTEE.

Report from the Committee of Chairmen of the Standing Committee, that they have appointed the Viscount Cross Chairman of the Standing Committee; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

STANDING COMMITTEE.

To meet to-morrow at Four o'clock.

LIGHT LOCOMOTIVES (IRELAND) BILL.

Amendments reported [according to order], and Bill to be read 3ª to-morrow.

BANK HOLIDAYS (IRELAND) BILL.

Read 3ª [according to order], and passed.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 23rd March, 1903.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz:—

West Cumberland Electric Tramways Bill.

South Yorkshire Joint Railways Bill.

Ordered, that the Bills be read a second time.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz:—

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.

Ordered, that the Bill be read a second time to-morrow.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.—

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time to-morrow.

Dublin Improvement (Bull Alley Area) Bill; Great Western Railway (Pension Fund) Bill.

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Croydon and District Electric Tramways Bill; Great Central Railway Bill; Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway Bill; South Shields, Sunderland, and District Tramways Bill.

Read a second time, and committed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP B).

The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN informed the House that the Committee on Group B of Private Bills not being appointed to meet until to-morrow, the parties opposing the Bath Corporation Water Bill, which was set down for consideration on the first day of the meeting of the Committee, had appeared before him and proved that the evidence of Samuel Frederick Andrews, General Manager of the West Gloucestershire Water Company, was essential to their case, and that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House.

Ordered, That Samuel Frederick Andrews do attend the Committee on Group B of Private Bills to-morrow at Twelve of the Clock.

WELLINGBOROUGH AND DISTRICT TRAMROADS BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

POLICE AND SANITARY REGULATIONS.

Ordered, That the Committee of Selection do nominate a Committee not exceeding eleven members, to be called the Police and Sanitary Committee, to whom shall be committed all Private Bills promoted by municipal and other local authorities by which it is proposed to create powers relating to police or sanitary regulations in conflict with, deviation from, or excess of the provisions of the general law.

Ordered, that Standing Orders 150 and 173A apply to all such Bills.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That four be the quorum of the Committee.

Ordered, That if the Committee consider that any Clauses of any Bill referred to them (other than Clauses containing Police and Sanitary Regulations) are such as, having regard to the terms of the reference to the Committee, it is not necessary or advisable for them to deal with, they may at any time make a Special Report to the Committee of Selection to that effect, and the Committee of Selection shall then refer the Bill to a Select Committee, who shall consider those Clauses and the Preamble and report the whole Bill to the House, specifying in their Report which Clauses have been considered by the Police and Sanitary Committee, and which Clauses have been considered by the Select Committee.

Ordered, That the Committee have power, if they so determine, to sit as two Committees, and in that event to apportion the Bills referred to the Committee between the two Committees, each of which shall have the full powers of, and be subject to the instructions which apply to, the undivided Committee; and that three be the quorum of each of the two Committees.—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

PETITIONS.

COUNTY COURTS JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Cheltenham; Scottish Trade Protection Society; Norwich; Manchester; Bradford; Eastbourne; and Wakefield; to lie upon the Table.

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from New Spynie; and Brechin; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Montrose, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF RIVERS AND STREAMS BILL.

Petition from Montrose, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petitions against: from Leeds; Woolwich; Dolgelly; and Headington; to lie upon the Table.

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

Petition from Montrose, against establishment; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Altrincham; and Lincoln; to lie upon the Table.

TOWN COUNCILS (SCOTLAND).

Petition from Montrose, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOAN FUND BOARD (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Sixty-fifth Annual Report, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAYS ABANDONMENT.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade respecting the Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill and the objects thereof [pursuant to Standing Order 158A]; referred to the Committee on the Bill.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 18th March, 1903, declaring that William Barber, Artificer, Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (NAVY VOTES).

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 18th March, 1903, authorising the temporary application of surpluses on certain Navy Votes for the year 1902–3 to meet excesses on other Navy Votes for the same year [pursuant to Resolution of the House of 4th March, 1879]; to lie upon the Table.

ALIENS.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address, 6th March; *Mr. Cochrane*]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. (No. 86.)

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.

BRIDLINGTON PIERS AND HARBOUR.

Copy of Abstract of the General Annual Account for the yea ending 26th July, 1902 [by Act].

DEATHS FROM STARVATION OR ACCELERATED BY PRIVATION (LONDON).

Address for "Return of the number of all deaths in the administrative county of London, in the year 1902, upon which a coroner's jury has returned a verdict of death from starvation or death accelerated by privation; together with any observations furnished to the Local Government Board by Boards of Guardians with reference to cases included in the Return (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 342, of Session 1902)."—(*Mr. Talbot.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Waltham Abbey Sanitary Inspector—Visits to Government Property.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will explain why the Sanitary Inspector at Waltham Abbey is not allowed to visit the Government houses and cottages, as well as the houses of private owners.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Under Clause 327 of the Public Health Act of 1875 War Department property is exempted from disturbance or interference on the part of the local authority. It does not appear, moreover, that the local sanitary inspector has ever made any attempt to visit Government houses at Waltham.

Dewsbury Post Office—Improved Sanitary Accommodation.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury): To ask the Postmaster-General what steps, if any, have been taken to improve the sanitary arrangements of the Dewsbury Post Office; and whether, in view of the overcrowding and the accommodation afforded for telegraphists, telephonists, and postmen at the present premises, he will say what steps are being taken to extend the building or to secure new premises.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) Some minor improvements were effected in the sanitary arrangements of the Dewsbury Post Office during the past year, and though the accommodation is not so ample as could be desired there is not at present any serious overcrowding. In view of the approaching expiration of the lease, inquiries have been going on as to the best method of improving the accommodation, and a scheme for a new post office is under consideration.

British South Africa—Forced Labour.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the rector of Thaba'nchu has stated that, upon the visit of inspection by the Governor, all able-bodied men not at that moment employed have been sent away to work in various places at the discretion of their captors; and what steps he proposes to take to prevent a system of forced labour and slavery being set up in British South Africa.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) My attention has been drawn to a letter which appeared in the Press on the 17th instant, signed by the rector of Thaba'nchu, and inquiry will be made with regard to it. In reply to the second Question, I would refer to my remarks last Thursday.†

Judicial Trustees.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General how many judicial trustees have been appointed under the provisions of the Judicial Trustees Act, 1896.

(*Answered by Sir Robert Finlay.*) Forty-nine judicial trustees have been appointed under the provisions of the Judicial Trustees Act up to the 20th March, 1903.

Trees in Phœnix Park—Damage by Storm.

MR. HEALY (Louth, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what sum has the Board of Works spent on extra labour, and how many extra workmen have been employed, since the devastation of the Phœnix Park by storm; what provision has been made for the removal of the 3,000 fallen trees which encumber the park; why was no effort made to save some of the younger trees by uprighting and trimming them; who will consider the question of the refurnishing of the park with trees and shrubs; why only young trees of the cheapest and commonest variety were planted two years ago, and why no effort was made to obtain ornamental trees and shrubs such as are planted in the London Royal Parks, although a list of these was supplied to the Irish Board of Works; and whether the Treasury will give instructions that estimates should be obtained from expert landscape gardeners and nurserymen with a view to the future laying out of the Park on a proper scale.

---

† See page 1275.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) By the kind permission of the Colonel of the 21st Lancers, about 400 men of that regiment were occupied for two days in clearing the road behind the Viceregal Demesne, in order to enable the regiment to use that road in passing to and from the park. In addition to these, twenty extra men have been employed and £40 expended on extra labour; fifty-four of the permanent labourers of the park have also been employed in clearing fallen trees from roads, park gardens, and other places where their removal was urgently required, at a cost of about £125. Advertisements were inserted in the public Press inviting offers from timber merchants and contractors for removing the timber. Only one offer was received, and, as the price was inadequate and the time required excessive, the offer was declined. The Board have now decided to employ a number of extra labourers and deal with the matter themselves. Owing to the universal destruction of trees throughout Ireland, the consequent glut in the timber market, and the difficulty of procuring expert woodcutters, there will be some delay in getting the park entirely cleared. In almost all cases the extra labourers have to be taught the art of woodcutting and sawing. There are no trees now encumbering the park in the sense of blocking the roads and pathways. There are no young trees blown down in the open park that are capable of being uprighted with any hope of success. A few small trees in the park gardens have been so treated. I presume that the trees planted two years ago, to which the hon. Member refers, are the avenue of sycamore trees planted on each side of the road west of the Wellington Memorial. These trees were planted in pursuance of a general scheme drawn up some years ago, and I am informed that, having regard to the soil and surroundings, they are quite suitable for the position. Some hundreds of new, rare, and ornamental trees and shrubs have been planted in the park gardens and in the vicinity during the last two years. Almost all the trees and shrubs mentioned on the list supplied from the London Royal Parks, which are suitable for the exposure and soil conditions of the Phœnix Park, are already represented there. There are also, in addition, many varieties of trees and shrubs in the Phœnix Park which are not named on that list. The Phœnix Park differs in many ways from the London parks, and it must not be assumed that the treatment which suits one will suit the other. I will consider whether, in arranging for the future planting of the Phœnix Park, the Board of Works should not be allowed to obtain the assistance of experts, whether professional or amateur. If this were done, it might be possible to lay down a general scheme which could be gradually carried out in future years.

Promotion of Naval Schoolmasters.

Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): To ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty whether it is the intention of the Admiralty to give to head schoolmasters in the Navy the same opportunities of promotion as have been promised to the other ranks of Naval warrant officers in Lord Selborne's Memorandum of 25th December, 1902.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) Representations have been received on the subject and the matter is now engaging the attention of the Board of Admiralty.

Plumbers in the Navy—Rates of Pay.

Mr. KEARLEY (Devonport): To ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty whether any decision has been arrived at with regard to the pay and *status* of plumbers and plumbers' mates serving in the Royal Navy who have received no increase in their pay for thirty-five years, notwithstanding that the pay of plumbers of the Royal Dockyards has advanced in the same period from 24s. to 32s. 6d. per week.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) Nothing is known of any proposal to improve the pay and *status* of plumbers and plumbers' mates serving in the Fleet.

Naval Shooting—Names of Prizewinners.

MR. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the decision of the Admiralty to present medals to the best shots in each ship, the winner's name, with score and nature of gun, will be displayed on the lower deck of each ship as an encouragement to the men of the Fleet.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) It is not proposed to adopt the suggestion of the hon. Member.

Navy Rations—Improvement in Cooking.

MR. HARMSWORTH: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the revision in the dietary scale to take effect next October will be accompanied by improvements in the system of cooking and serving food now in force in the Royal Navy.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) There are three cookery schools for the Navy, one at each of the principal Home ports. Ships' cooks are specially trained at these schools in the best methods of cooking whatever articles are supplied in Navy rations. Improved arrangements have been made for preparing tea, which will enable each mess to prepare its own. Arrangements have been made for improving the method of serving the food by adding knife, fork, basin and plate, and improved spoon to the present scale of seamen's mess utensils.

Private Paths in Chatham Dockyard.

MR. HARMSWORTH: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state whether it was by order of the Lords of the Admiralty that a notice was recently put up in Chatham Dockyard to the effect that the footpaths in the yard were reserved for the use of officers only; whether any, and if so how many, men have been punished for breaches of this order; and will he explain why this notice was removed just previous to a recent visit to the yard by the First Lord of the Admiralty, and was replaced immediately after the visit.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold Forster.*) No notice to this effect has recently been issued in Chatham Dockyard, nor have there been any recent instances of men being punished as suggested by the hon. Member. There is a footpath opposite the official residences in the yard which has been reserved for many years past for the use of officers, but I am not aware that the notice was taken down and replaced as suggested in the Question.

Glass Balls on Mastheads of Men-of-War.

MR. HARMSWORTH: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state whether the glass balls affixed to the mastheads of men-of-war are purchased by the State; and, if not, by whom are they supplied and paid for.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) Glass balls are occasionally placed on the mastheads of ships for the purposes of decoration. They are not purchased by the State, but are placed there by the officers, who, I presume, pay for them, unless, as I believe frequently happens, they are presented by friends who have a special admiration for the ship, or for those who sail in her.

Special Greenwich Hospital Pensions.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will consider the advisability of extending the benefits of the Special Greenwich Hospital Pensions, now granted to officers and warrant officers only, to fifty chief petty officers, and of making the pensions so granted £20 per annum each.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) All chief petty officers are at the present time eligible for assistance from Greenwich Hospital Special Funds and for the Greenwich Hospital Age Pension. The establishment of a fixed pension for fifty chief petty officers similar to the Greenwich Hospital Pensions at present in force for warrant officers would necessitate the withdrawal of the above privileges which the whole class at present receive. In view of these facts, and of the recent considerable increase in the rate of pension awarded these men from Naval funds, there appears no sufficient reason to grant the further privilege suggested in the Question.

Promotion and Pay in the Naval Medical Deparment.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it is proposed to improve the Naval Medical Department with respect to promotion and pay, so as to place it on a like footing with the Army Medical Service.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) On 24th March, 1902, an Order in Council was issued raising the pay of Naval medical officers and placing it practically on an equality with that of officers of the Royal Army Medical Corps. Promotion both in the medical branch of the Navy and in the Royal Army Medical Corps is by seniority until the administrative grades are reached, when promotion by selection is practised. Special promotions for conspicuous professional merit or for war service are made in the Naval Medical Service. Owing to the great differences between the Navy and Army it is impossible to conduct the medical services on exactly similar lines.

New Victualling Scheme.—Increased Allowance to Pensioners.

MR. LOCKIE (Devonport): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that the new victualling scheme will cost more than the old scale, it is proposed to increase the present allowance of 1s. 1d. per day to pensioners.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The reply to the hon. Member's Question is in the negative. The amount of the allowance was fixed more than thirty years ago with reference to the value of the ration at that date; and owing to the subsequent falls in the prices of various articles of food, the allowance has for some years exceeded the actual value of the old ration, and will still be higher than the estimated value of the new ration.

Naval Works Acts—Expenditure.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will state what is the approximate amount issued, during the year ending 31st March, 1903, for the purposes of the Naval Works Acts.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The following advances have been issued by the Treasury: Midsummer. 1902, £900,000; Michaelmas, 1902, £748,000; Christmas, 1902, £610,000; Lady Day, 1903, £890,000; Total, £3,148,000. The unexpended balance of advances on 31st March, 1902, amounted to £221,404.

Education Act, 1902—Applications under Section 11 (1).

MR. YOXALL: To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education how many applications under Section 11 (1) of the Education Act, 1902, have been received by the Board; in how many cases the application was to modify the trust deed; and in how many cases it was for an order where no trust deed existed; whether any orders have been made which have the effect of rendering the religious teaching in a school denominational where it has hitherto been undenominational; and, if no such orders have been yet made, is it the intention of the Board of Education to make such orders in cases where existing schools are undenominational.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) Up to 21st March, 10,214 applications for orders under Section 11 had been received by the Board. As the classification of the applications has not yet been completed, it is not possible at present to say how many are for orders to modify the trust deed, and how many are for orders to meet cases where no trust deed exists. No orders have been made which will have the effect of rendering the religious teaching in a school denominational where it has hitherto been undenominational. Nor have the Board power under Section 11 to make any such order or to give any directions as to the form of religious instruction to be given in schools.

Training Colleges—Practical Examination in Science.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if it has been decided that there shall be no practical examination in science at the training college examinations this year; and, if so, whether the Board will reconsider their decision in view of their circular issued to the training colleges in June, 1901, prescribing that the science teaching should in future be of a practical and experimental character.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The Board regret that it is impossible this year to make the requisite arrangements for carrying out a practical examination in science for some 1,500 students in training colleges on lines which would secure a sufficiently uniform standard of marking to prevent unfairness in the results of the examination over the whole country. But the written examination papers in science this year will be carefully designed upon lines which will necessitate that a student should have pursued a systematic course of practical instruction in order to get any considerable number of marks in the subject. It is intended that next year's examination shall be of an essentially practical character.

Education Act, 1902—Payment of Grants by Instalments.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether under Circular 477, issued by the Board of Education in connection with the initial financial difficulty of putting the Education Act into operation, the payment of Exchequer Grants by instalments is to be confined to the financial year 1903–4, or whether some similar plan for meeting the financial obligations which will fall due under the earlier operations of the Act will be extended to the financial year 1904–5.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) It is confidently anticipated that the Treasury will be able to provide for the continuance in 1904–5 of arrangements similar to those made for 1903–4.

Education Act, 1902—Section 18 (1) (d).

Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE: To ask the President of the Local Government Board if a County Council can raise a sum separately chargeable under Section 18 (1) (d) of The Education Act, 1902, by a precept directed to the overseers of the parish chargeable, or in what other manner; and whether the County Rate Act applies to rates leviable for educational purposes.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) A sum separately chargeable to a parish under Section 18 (1) (d) of the Act referred to would appear to be expenditure for a special county purpose within Section 68 of The Local Government Act, 1888, and any amount required for the purpose could be levied as a county contribution from the parish by including it in a precept on the guardians. Sums raised from rates by County Councils for the purpose of the Act of 1902 should be raised in manner provided by Section 68 of The Local Government Act, 1888. The County Rates Act, 1852, as modified by the Act of 1888, would apply to the case.

Convictions for Illegal Trawling in Scotland.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Lord Advocate if the Secretary for Scotland will state the number of trawlers convicted of illegal trawling on the coasts of Scotland from the 1st January, 1902, to the present time, the names of the cruisers through whose action they were respectively detected, and the number of convictions secured through detections made by lightkeepers and coastguardsmen respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The number of convictions within the time stated was twenty-one. Of these six were detected by the cruiser "Minna," two by the "Brenda," two by the "Vigilant," and one by the "Jackal." Lighthouse keepers reported four cases and coastguardsmen four.

Distress in South Uist.

Mr. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness): To ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, if his attention has been drawn to the distress existing on the property of Lady Gordon Cathcart, in South Uist; whether he is aware that applications to the proprietress to be permitted to rent land to relieve the congestion have been refused, and that the crofters in the district have taken possession of a portion of the land to plant their crops; and whether, seeing that at the request of the local authorities the crofters have suspended the operations they commenced, he wil state whether the Congested Districts Board is prepared to take any and, if so, what action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) Petitions have been presented to the Congested Districts Board and to the Secretary for Scotland, complaining of poverty, and desiring allocation of land among certain of the cottars in South Uist, but nothing has come before the Secretary for Scotland disclosing any exceptional amount of distress at the present time. The Secretary for Scotland has been informed by Lady Gordon Cathcart's agents that there have been no individual applications for specific pieces of land, but that a letter was received by the factor, signed by four persons, containing a general request for land, and ending up with a threat of disturbance. The Secretary for Scotland has received reports from the police showing that some of the inhabitants have spread seaweed over certain lands now in occupation of a tenant under lease from the owner, and from this it may be inferred that further illegal action was contemplated. With regard to the last paragraph of the hon. Member's Question, the Secretary for Scotland can authorise no inquiry through the Congested Districts Board or otherwise so long as any evidence of actual or intended illegal action remains.

Public House Licences.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether holders of licences of public houses which are being closed will have such portion of the money paid for their licences refunded to them as may have been paid for the time subsequent to the closing of the house.

(*Answered by Mr. Ritchie.*) When a public house is closed in consequence of the non-renewal of the magistrates' certificate, and not in consequence of any conviction recorded against the holder of the certificate, so much of the duty on the current excise licence for the premises as is applicable to the complete unexpired quarters of the year covered by the licence is repaid, in accordance with Section 24 of the Act, 6 Geo. IV. c. 81, on application being made to the Board of Inland Revenue through the local supervisor. Thus, in the case of a public house in England closed on the 5th April (*i.e.*, a full six months before the 10th October, when the excise licence would ordinarily have expired), a repayment of half the excise licence duty would be allowed.

Chief Judge of Lower Burma—Qualifications.

MR. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state the reasons for which it was decided not to follow existing Indian precedents in regard to the qualifications for the post of the Chief Judge of the Chief Court of Lower Burma.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) The hon. Member is mistaken in thinking that existing Indian precedents have not been followed in the case of the Chief Court of Lower Burma. In the Punjab, the only other province where a Chief Court exists, the Chief Judge may be, and often has been, a civilian and not a barrister. Before the Chief Court was established at Rangoon the Appellate Court of that city consisted of only one barrister Judge, the Recorder; there are now two barrister Judges in the Chief Court besides two civilian Judges. Besides the judicial business of the seaports, which forms but a small portion of the work of the Court, the Chief Court has the control and supervision over the whole of the Courts of the interior of the country, and it was thought necessary that the Chief Judge of the Court, in whose hands rests the distribution of business and the inspection and supervision of the Courts, should be an officer well acquainted with the customs and language of the people and with the practical working of those Courts. For this reason it was decided that the Chief Judge should for the present be a civilian.

India—Case of Captain Winter.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for India what action the Viceroy or the Military authorities intend to take with regard to Captain Winter, who was convicted and fined by the Bombay Police Court for a gross insult to a native barrister and his wife in a railway carriage on 10th February.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) I have observed a report in the newspapers of the case referred to, and of the decision of the magistrate. I have no doubt that the Government of India have taken due notice of the very reprehensible conduct of Captain Winter, but it does not seem necessary to make special inquiries on the subject.

Dogs sold by the Police.

DR. SHIPMAN (Northampton): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in the case of dogs sold by the police, he will direct that every purchaser shall give his or her name and address, and shall be required to pay the dog tax before taking possession of the dog.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*) No, Sir; I do not see my way to issuing any such directions.

South Africa—Importation of Labour.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs with whom the arrangement has been made to obtain 1,000 labourers in Central Africa for South Africa; and whether he will lay upon the Table of the House Papers explaining the nature of that arrangement and the instructions that have been sent to the British authorities in Central Africa with respect to it.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The arrangement made to obtain labourers not exceeding 1,000 in number in British Central Africa for South Africa has been made with the Native Labour Association through the High Commissioner for South Africa. The Papers will be laid without delay.

English Shareholders in Foreign Undertakings.

MR. LABOUCHERE: To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government adheres to the declaration of Count von Bülow in the German Reichsrath that it is a principle of British commercial policy that Englishmen invest their capital abroad at their own risk; and whether this principle will be fully acted upon in regard to Venezuela.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The principles of our commercial policy in the respect mentioned are sufficiently explained by the recent action of His Majesty's Government in the Venezuelan controversy and by their declarations in regard to it made in both Houses of Parliament. We cannot undertake any responsibility for the statement attributed to Count Bülow.

British Coaling Stations in Tripoli.

MR LABOUCHERE: To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been directed to the statement made in the Italian Chamber by the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs; and whether Lord Lansdowne has assured the Italian Ambassador in London, and His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Rome has assured the Italian Government, that there is no intention to establish British coal depôts either at Bombah or Fobruck, or at any other point on the seaboard of Tripoli.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The answer to both Questions is in the affirmative. The rumour is absolutely without foundation.

Canal Rates in Ireland.

MR. KENNEDY (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can now state whether the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction will exercise its powers under Section 17 of the Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899, of appearing before the Railway and Canal Commissioners on behalf of the boat-owners on the Royal Canal who feel aggrieved by reason of the tolls charged by the Midland Great Western Railway on canal traffic, when added to working expenses, being in excess of the freight charged on that company's railway for the same class of goods, thereby destroying the competition of the canal.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Department is in communication with the railway company on the subject of the complaints of the boat-owners. Until the correspondence has concluded the department cannot say what further action it may be necessary to take.

Education in Ireland—Grants.

MR. BOLAND: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to resolutions passed at conferences recently held in Dublin, at which delegates were present representative of educational associations of every denomination, concerned with secondary education; and whether, in apportioning the equivalent grant, he will take these representations into consideration.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The reply to this Question is in the affirmative. As already stated, I hope shortly to make an announcement on the subject.

Training of Volunteers—Artillery.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will favourably consider applications from corps now equipped and trained as mobile Artillery to be continued as such under the same conditions as Imperial Yeomanry, that is, on the basis of twelve battery field drills, to be paid as half-days, and a fourteen days' minimum camp, giving a total of twenty days' minimum training per annum in addition to the usual evening drills.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The hon. Member presumably refers to Volunteer Artillery. Any proposal of the kind indicated would certainly be considered.

Meat Contracts.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): To ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been called to the terms of the meat contracts; and whether he will alter them to make it clear as to whether they are for British and Irish grown meat, or for frozen and chilled meat, or meat from animals killed at Deptford, the wharves, or other places within ten days after arrival from abroad.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The existing conditions for dead meat contracts show quite clearly that the supply of beef must be British or Irish grown, not frozen or chilled, and not from animals killed at Deptford or elsewhere within ten days of arrival from abroad, and that the supply of mutton may be frozen provided that it comes from a British Colony, and that, as regards hospital supplies, the medical officer approves. It would not appear that anything is required to make the terms of the contracts clearer.

Map of Somaliland in Tea Room.

MR. ROUND (Essex, Harwich): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will have a map of Somaliland placed in the tea room for the information of Members.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Yes, Sir.

Royal Artillery Commissions for University Candidates.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is intended that Commissions for the Royal Artillery are to be available for all University candidates who take honours, or only for a certain number to be selected by competition.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Until the details have been worked out with the Universities no definite announcement can be made in regard to them, but it may be stated that Commissions in the Royal Artillery cannot be made available for all University candidates who take honours.

Military Works Acts—Expenditure.

MR. BUCHANAN: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state what is the approximate amount issued during the year ending 31st March, 1903, for the purposes of the Military Works Acts.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) It is estimated that the expenditure during 1902–3 under the Military Works Acts will amount to about £1,700,000.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Flogging of a Drummer-boy in the Guards.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that a drummer-boy of 1st Grenadier Guards, having left the barracks on Coronation night to see the illuminations, was on his return severely flogged by Sergeant Drummer Sinclair, and afterwards handed over to his fellow boy drummers, who tossed him in a blanket, with the result that he was unable to stand upright on parade next day, and was then sent to hospital; and that Sergeant Drummer Sinclair was, in consequence, reduced to the ranks one day and re-instated in full the next; and will he state what steps have been taken to prevent a repetition of these practices.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): A boy of the 1st Battalion Grenadier Guards broke out of barracks on the evening of the 9th August, 1902. The fact was discovered and reported to the sergeant drummer of the battalion, who failed to report the matter to superior authority, took the law into his own hands, and personally chastised the boy. The boy's back was examined by Lieutenant-Colonel Kinloch and by a surgeon, and they were of opinion that the boy had received a severe caning. The bruises on the boy's back were stated not to have been inflicted by Sergeant Drummer Sinclair, but at the hands of a certain number of drummers of the battalion, who, it was feared by Lieutenant-Colonel Kinloch, had been instigated by the sergeant-drummer to do so. Lieutenant-Colonel Kinloch stated that he feared the sergeant drummer had been in the habit of carrying out the duties of his responsible position in a most improper and reprehensible manner. Sergeant Drummer Sinclair was tried by a District Court-martial on the 29th August, 1902, in connection with this matter, and was sentenced to be reduced to the rank of corporal, but was recommended to mercy on account of his previous excellent character. It was stated in evidence before the Court-martial that, after the boy had been beaten by the sergeant drummer with a stick, some of the other boys tossed him in a blanket and beat him. The boy himself stated before the Court-martial that, as his back was all bruised, he asked leave from church, but was refused. Sergeant Drummer Sinclair's reduction to the rank of corporal bore date 29th August, 1902, and it has only now been brought to the notice of the War Office that he was re-appointed sergeant drummer on the 4th September, 1902, by the officer commanding the Grenadier Guards, on the recommendation of the officer commanding the 1st Battalion. The circumstances under which this reinstatement was made are being investigated by the adjutant-general.

Civil Service Clerks in the War Office.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will grant the Return relative to established (certificated) Civil Service clerks on the Paper this day.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I am afraid my right hon. friend cannot consent to grant the Return on the Paper.

MR. FLAVIN: Last year I was refused a Return owing to the progress of the war. Why is it that, now the war is over, I am still refused?

LORD STANLEY: The Return cannot be granted.

MR. FLAVIN: Then I shall become a member of the Fourth Party, and make further inquiries.

Drafts for South Africa.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the age and size of the later drafts sent to South Africa, and whether he will call for a Report upon them.

LORD STANLEY: My hon. friend is perhaps unaware that there is no limit for age as regards drafts for South Africa in peace time, and therefore recruits are despatched to their units there as soon as possible. South Africa is considered a very suitable training ground for the young soldier. The paragraphs recently furnished to the Press appear to be exaggerated.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: Are recruits of seventeen or eighteen sent out to South Africa?

Lord STANLEY: Yes: they are sent there just as they are sent to home battalions. We are testing the system in order to decide whether it shall be continued.

Range Finders.

Mr. ORR-EWING (Ayr Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state the result of the trials of eight range finders that took place at Aldershot in November last.

Lord STANLEY: None of the instruments were considered altogether satisfactory, and further trials will be carried out as soon as the improved instruments, as ordered, have been received.

Army Works Bill.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what amount of money will be required under the proposed Army Works Bill, and how much of the total sum will be expended within the next financial year.

Lord STANLEY: If the hon. Member will kindly refer to my reply to a Question put by the hon. Member for East Perthshire on the 16th instant, he will find that I stated that I could not at present answer this point.†

Acquisition of Land for National Defence.

Mr. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he, in conjunction with the Admiralty, will grant the Return as to Acquisition of Land for National Defence.

Lord STANLEY: A Return of the property purchased on Salisbury Plain has been given. I am not prepared to promise a Return involving any considerable labour and the publication of the exact locality of a number of sites specially selected for defence work.

Coastguard Signal Stations—Wireless Telegraphy.

Sir JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will give the names of the six signal stations of the coastguard already fitted with wireless telegraphy apparatus and of the eight others to be fitted with such apparatus during the coming financial year, and state whether these stations are available for communication, when required, between mercantile vessels and the shore.

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.): The following stations have been established:—Dover, Culver Cliff, Portland, Rame Head, Scillys, and Roches Point. The following are proposed to be fitted during the next financial year:—Bere Island, Spurn Head, Alderney, St. Abb's Head, St. Ann's Head, Landguard, Port Patrick, Duncansby Head. As regards commercial signalling it is proposed to carry this out from the stations which will be included in the new Lloyds-Admiralty agreement, which are:—Culver Cliff, Scillys, Spurn Head, St. Abb's Head, Portland, St. Ann's Head, Duncansby Head, and Roches Point.

Osborne Naval College.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is proposed to be the character of the new Naval College at Osborne; will it be a branch of the Dartmouth Naval College and receive the same cadets, entered under the same conditions, for the same training; or, if not, in what respects will it differ from the Dartmouth College; how many cadets will be accommodated at Osborne; and when is it proposed that the first batch shall join.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Cadets entered under the new scheme will in the first instance be sent to the Naval College at Osborne, whence a portion of them will proceed to Dartmouth on the opening of the new Naval College. Cadets entered under the hitherto existing arrangements will proceed to the "Britannia" as long as the entries continue to be made under that system. I cannot at present say how many cadets Osborne College will ultimately accommodate. It is proposed that the first batch shall join on the 15th September.

---

† See page 841.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Do I understand that all the Naval cadets under the new scheme will go to Osborne?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes, Sir.

New Admiralty Yacht.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, was the tender for the new Admiralty yacht one based on a definite specification and design, or were the conditions of that tender that each firm was to submit its own proposed designs and specifications and a tender for carrying them out; and, if the latter, will the Board of Admiralty consider the advisability of adopting a similar plan of tender for harbours, breakwaters, and other works, with a view of obtaining alternative designs and specifications for these works.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The firms were asked to tender for a sea-going vessel of a certain speed suitable for use as an Admiralty yacht. Certain definite conditions were laid down, but no complete designs and specifications were supplied. In reply to the latter part of the hon. Member's Question, the practice usually followed at the Admiralty is to obtain a tender on definite specifications and design, but the Admiralty would be prepared to adopt the system under which the design and plan of works are made the subject of competition in any case in which in their opinion it offered distinct advantages.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): May I ask if the Board of Admiralty submitted specifications and designs to the various firms who were asked to tender?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, Sir.

Alaskan Boundary Tribunal.

MR. ROSE (Cambridgeshire, Newmarket): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Convention signed at Washington, 24th January, 1903, for the adjustment of the boundary between the dominion of Canada and the Territory of Alaska aims at arbitration for a settlement of the dispute or is to be confined to a judicial interpretation of the boundary line.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The duties of the tribunal established by the Convention is stated in the Convention itself to be to consider judicially the questions submitted, and its decision is to be final and binding upon all parties.

Jamaica Finances.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, is he aware that on the 18th February last a Bill was introduced into the Legislative Council of the Crown Colony of Jamaica by the Colonial Secretary of that colony, empowering the guarantee out of the general revenues and assets of the colony, and the payment by the island treasurer of the interest on the capital employed in establishing central sugar factories; has he considered whether such guarantee and payment of interest will constitute the grant of a direct or indirect bounty on the manufacture or exportation of sugar such as His Majesty's Government have undertaken by Article I. and Protocol A of the Sugar Convention shall not be established in the United Kingdom or any of the Crown colonies; and will the question be submitted to the Permanent Commission at Brussels.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The Bill referred to, which amends a previous law, has not yet been received from the Governor, nor am I aware whether it has been passed into law. In these circumstances perhaps the hon. Member would postpone his Question for about a fortnight.

Brussels Sugar Convention.

MR GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, when do His Majesty's Government propose to fulfil their obligation, under Art. VII. of the Brussels Sugar Convention, to communicate to the Brussels Permanent Commission the Laws, Orders, and Regulations on the taxation of sugar in Great Britain and the Crown colonies, in order to enable that Commission to pronounce whether any direct or indirect bounty on the production or exportation of sugar is granted in Great Britain or British Crown colonies; do His Majesty's Government propose similarly to communicate the Laws, Orders, and Regulations in question existing in the self-governing colonies; and can he say when it is proposed that the Permanent Commission shall hold its first meeting.

THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): The obligation in question will be fulfilled as soon as possible after the meeting of the Commission. His Majesty's Government will also be prepared to communicate any laws, etc., of the self-governing colonies which may be desired by the Commission. It is hoped that the Commission will meet at an early date.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Must it not meet before the 1st June?

LORD CRANBORNE: I am not able to give more precise information.

Cretan Administration.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs when the Reports of Prince George of Greece, High Commissioner for Crete, on the administration of that island for 1899 and the three following years will be laid upon the Table.

LORD CRANBORNE: There are no communications from the High Commissioner which His Majesty's Government are at present prepared to lay before Parliament.

Macedonian Reforms.

MR. STEVENSON: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is able to communicate any information as to the progress of the steps taken for securing the proper execution of the joint scheme of reforms for the Macedonian vilayets.

LORD CRANBORNE: We have no special information to report; the British Consuls have been instructed to keep in communication with their Russian and Austrian colleagues, and to assist and support them, both in obtaining information and in joining in any representations calculated to promote the effective application of the reforms.

Portuguese Import Duties.

MR. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any and, if so, what representations have been made to Portugal in respect to the proposed duties to be placed on the import of British machinery.

LORD CRANBORNE: While the late Portuguese Government was in office His Majesty's Minister at Lisbon was instructed to urge that such of the proposed duties as were specially injurious to British trade should be reduced. Sir M. Gosselin has been informed since the change of Ministry that the scheme of the late Government is being carefully examined by the new Minister of Finance.

International Mercantile Marine Company.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, what are the general lines of agreement between His Majesty's Government and Mr. Pierpont Morgan's Shipping Trust, now known as the International Mercantile Marine Company, which had been settled and accepted by both parties on 23rd February last; does this agreement relate to the transfer by British owners to that company of nearly one million tons of British shipping, and is that company a foreign company; and, if so, can he explain on what grounds the ships in question continue to fly the British flag and to sail under a British register, contrary to the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894; and, in view of the delay of over five months that has occurred, will he now undertake to lay the agreement upon the Table within a definite period.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The general lines of the agreement are in the terms announced by me in my speech at Sheffield on September 30th last and reported in *The Times* of the following day. I have explained on previous occasions that the arrangements entered into with the British companies that are associated with the combine do not involve the transfer of ships, but the transfer of shares in those companies. Without being able to state definitely when the formal agreement will be laid before Parliament, I think I am in a position to undertake that it will be ready for execution by the parties before Easter.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the right hon. Gentleman favour me with a copy of his speech at Sheffield? I have not seen the report.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I dare say it can be seen in the Library, in the file of *The Times*.

Corn Tax—Export of Offals.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether there has been any increase in the export of offals from the United Kingdom since the corn tax was reimposed as compared with the corresponding period in previous years; and, if so, if he will say what has been the amount of such increase; and what is the amount of rebate allowed per ton on offal exported.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): It is impossible to make a trustworthy comparison between the periods before and after the imposition of the Grain, etc. Duty, because there is no exact statistical record of the export of offals before April, 1902. A drawback of 2s. 6d. a ton is allowed on the export of wheat offal produced from imported grain.

Identification of Motor Cars.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): On behalf of the hon. Member for Orkney and Shetland I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been directed to an accident caused by a motorist whereby a cyclist was carried into hospital unconscious; and whether, in view of the rate at which such vehicles are constantly driven, the Government will introduce legislation with the object of compelling all motors to be so marked that they will be capable of identification.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (MR. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.), My right hon friend has asked me to answer this Question. As regards the accident referred to, I am informed that the driver of the motor car was apprehended by the police a few hours after the accident and charged at a police-court. He is now under remand. As was stated on Wednesday last† in reply to a Question put by my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Central Sheffield, the subject of motor cars is under consideration. I shall be glad if it is found practicable to introduce legislation for the purpose of dealing with the matter.

London Telegraph Service.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been directed to the fact that two female technical officers appointed in connection with the recently introduced intercommunication switch system in London, were selected over the heads of seniors possessing equal technical qualifications; and whether, seeing that in one case the official selected was taught switching duties by a telegraphist who is now passed over, he will state the reason for the selection of these officers.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The hon. Member has been misinformed. There is no question of promoting or passing over any officer. All that has been done is to assign to particular duties, carrying no special rank or pay, two officers who were believed to be competent to perform them.

Licensed Premises.

MR. D. A. MORGAN (Essex, Walthamstow): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can now state whether he will take steps, in the Finance Bill or otherwise, to define the term internal communication, occurring in Section 10

---

† See page 1103.

(1) of the Licensing Act, 1902, so that it shall not apply to the self-contained premises of wine and spirit merchants holding off-licences, and located in buildings in which other traders are carrying on their respective trades or business.

THE UNDER SECRETARY TO THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. COCHRANE, Ayrshire, N.): The Law Officers of the Crown have been asked for their opinion on the point: and in the meantime I cannot add anything to my former answer.

Shrewsbury Municipal Election Petition.

MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether the Report of the Commissioner who heard the recent municipal election petition at Shrewsbury has been received by him; whether he will furnish Members with a copy of the same; and whether he will, in regard to the terms of the Report, consider the advisability of directing the persons mentioned therein as having been guilty of bribery to be prosecuted.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): The Report has been received and will be laid on the Table. The Director of Public Prosecutions has been inquiring into the matter, and has instructed that in certain cases proceedings shall be instituted forthwith.

MR. LAWSON WALTON was understood to ask whether in regard to a charge of perjury arising out of these matters recently heard and dismissed by the local magistrates steps would be taken to submit a Bill to the Grand Jury.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The circumstances of the prosecution have been considered, and I do not think I should be justified in sending a Bill to the Grand Jury.

County Justices of the Peace.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether the qualification for a justice of the peace for a county, for any eldest son of any person qualified to serve as a knight of a shire, by 9 Anne, c. 5, and renewed by 18 Geo. 2, c. 20, s. 1, is still accepted as a qualification notwithstanding the repeal of the statute of Anne by 21 and 22 Vic., c. 26.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I shall be happy to discuss the question privately with my hon. friend.

Labour Legislation and Trade Combination.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the hon. Member for the Shipley Division of the West Riding if he will state what course he proposes to take with regard to the Motion standing in his name for Wednesday evening next.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, W.R., Shipley): I had intended to draw attention to the state of the law in regard to trade combinations, as regards both employers and employed, and to invite the House to pass a Resolution in favour of equal treatment, but I find that under the Rules of the House it will be impossible to get an adequate discussion of the Motion, and under the circumstances I propose to postpone the matter until the House has before it the Bill of the right hon. Baronet dealing with the subject.

Birdcage Walk.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether his attention has been called to the defective condition of the carriage way through Birdcage Walk; and whether he will consider the advisability of transferring its maintenance to the local authority.

MR. AILWYN FELLOWES (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): The answer to the hon. Member's first query is in the affirmative; to the second in the negative. The usual repairs could not be carried out last autumn, owing to the sittings of Parliament rendering it impossible to close the road; but it is proposed to put it into better condition as soon as possible. It is in contemplation to lay down wood pavement; but the funds for this are not at present available.

Church Street, Kensington.

Dr. FARQUHARSON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Board of Works has any jurisdiction over the houses about to be built north of the footpath in Church Street, Kensington, so as to ensure architectural uniformity and good taste; and whether arrangements will be made to retain the fifteen fine lime trees now fringing the present open space.

*The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Hayes Fisher, Fulham): The conditions for letting provide for the erection of the houses according to designs to be approved by the Commissioners of Woods and for the preservation of the trees (planes and not limes) on the front of the land.

Roxboro' Road School, Limerick.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say by what authority did the Commissioners of Education spend £198 on the repairs of the Roxboro' Road Schools, that the tenant, by the terms of the agreement, was bound to keep in repair.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): The Commissioners expended this money in the exercise of their discretion and in conformity with the law as administered by the Court of Chancery with reference to the management of trust property by trustees.

Irish Teachers—Capitation Grant.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the cause of the delay in the payment of the residual Capitation Grant due to national teachers for the year ended 31st December, 1902; and whether arrangements can be made by the Commissioners of National Education whereby those payments would be completed before 31st March, as was the custom up to the year 1900.

Mr. WYNDHAM: On Thursday last I replied fully to a similar Question put to me by my hon. friend the Member for South Belfast.†

Labourers' Cottage Scheme.

Mr. SHEEHAN (Cork Co., Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state on what grounds the Inspector of the Local Government Board decided that Denis Healy, who applied for a labourer's cottage (Scheme No.) on the farm of Mr. R. Barter, townland of Coolflugh, Matchy division of the Cork Rural District, was not an agricultural labourer within the meaning of the Labourers (Ireland) Acts.

Mr. WYNDHAM: One of the District Councillors for this Division stated on oath at the local inquiry that Healy was employed in the factory at Blarney.

North Dublin Fisheries.

Mr. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the injuries recently inflicted by trawlers on the nets of long-line fishermen off the coast of North Dublin; and whether any steps have been or will be taken to inquire whether in this instance the law has been violated; and, if so, to secure that the guilty parties shall be made amenable.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Four prosecutions are at present pending in respect of alleged infringements of the by-laws prohibiting trawling in these waters.

Fitzmaurice Estate.

Mr. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how the Fitzmaurice estate as regards sale to the tenants stands; has the Queen's County portion of it as yet been disposed of, and if so, at what average price in the number of years purchase and on what basis has the price been fixed; have any preliminary steps as yet been taken for the sale of the portion in Limerick and Tipperary, known respectively as the townlands of Coolnadhoun, and Clogheready North and Clogheready South; and if so, how far have they been carried.

---

† See page 1232.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Queen's County portion of this estate has been inspected pursuant to the request issued by the Land Judge. Pending the result of the sale of this portion no further proceedings will be taken in the matter of the sale of the remaining portions in Limerick and Tipperary.

Templemore Disturbances.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the investigation into the alleged encounter between the police and people near Templemore has been completed; and, if so, will he state the result.

MR. WYNDHAM: The preliminary investigation into the circumstances connected with the rioting that took place on this occasion has concluded. The report of the investigation is now before Government, and the question of the further steps to be taken will shortly be decided.

Promotion in the Dublin Sorting Office.

MR. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will state the length of service, pay previous to promotion, and present salary of the second division clerk recently promoted to the position of first-class assistant superintendent in the Dublin sorting office; also the number, length of service, and pay of the sorting office second-class assistant superintendents passed over by this officer.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The second division clerk referred to has had twelve years service, including six in other Departments than the post office. His pay prior to promotion was £130, and £250 on promotion. The number of second-class assistant superintendents in the Dublin office is twelve. Their pay ranges from £200 to £250—one officer, however, receiving £300, the maximum of an old scale. Their service up to the 1st instant ranges from fourteen to forty-three years.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): May I ask what Estimates are to be taken on Thursday?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): It is proposed to take Vote 10 and other Votes of the Army Estimates in Committee of Supply on Thursday, and afterwards a stage of the Consolidated Fund Bill.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Ordered, That the Proceedings on the Report from the Committee of Ways and Means be not interrupted this evening under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House), and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed.—(*Mr. Balfour.*)

SUPPLY [16TH MARCH]—REPORT.

Resolution reported.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903-4.

"That 127,100 men and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904, including 19,806 Royal Marines."

Resolution read a second time.

*MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he desired to move that the Vote be reduced by 4,600 men—the proposed increase in the current Estimate. The question was a large one, and no opportunity had so far been afforded of discussing that particular point. He deplored the action of the Secretary to the Admiralty the other night, in following the bad precedent of the last two or three years, in himself opening the discussion on the Estimates. The result had been to deprive hon. Members of the precedence they obtained in the ballot, and to produce merely disconnected debates. During the last few days an interesting Report had been issued by the Committee appointed by the Admiralty—and presided over by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwick—to deal with the question of the numbers in the Navy, and the difficulty likely to be experienced in recruiting the vast forces now required. It was desirable that the House should give a little attention to the findings of that Committee. In moving the reduction of the Vote he wished particularly to call attention to the way in which the Navy Estimates had been swollen this year. He had desired that day to put a question as to the amount of money to be spent under the Naval Works Bill this season, but did not get an answer owing to the absence of the Minister.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): It is impossible to give an Estimate at present.

*MR. LOUGH said he would put it roughly at £2,500,000, and that would bring the total expenditure on the Navy for the year up to £37,000,000—an amount equal to that demanded for the Army when the expenditure under the Military Works Bill is included. They thus were asked to provide the enormous sum of £74,000,000 for the two Services, and considering the vastness of that amount he urged that the House should hesitate before it pledged itself to impose such a serious burden on the nation. Ten years ago the cost of both Services was about £30,000,000, and when one thought of the immense growth of our Estimates yearly, it would be at once realised that unless some economy were effected in the Navy and Army it would be totally impossible for the country to secure any reduction whatever. The increased cost of education alone was sufficient to account for the growth in the Civil Service Estimates, and therefore if the House agreed to the present Army and Navy Estimates, all prospect of economy was removed from its purview. There were a certain number of gentlemen who thought that great economy might be effected in the Army Estimates, but then they suggested that if that were accomplished a larger amount of money would be available for spending on the Navy. That he suggested would be most unsatisfactory. In face of the great figures, in face of the feeling outdoors that some economy should be effected, the House surely ought to pause before it sanctioned that Vote for so large a number of men.

Now he wished to draw the attention of the House to the Report of the Committee appointed by the Admiralty to consider how the *personnel* of the Navy could be made more satisfactory. At the very threshold of that inquiry the Committee were informed that there had been an increase in the *personnel* of the Navy by 50,000 within the last fifteen years. But immediately that statement was made it was treated as nothing by the First Lord of the Admiralty, and the Committee was asked to inquire how the manning of the Navy might be brought up to date, and how especially the reserve for the Navy might be built up. The opinion of the members of the Committee was not asked with regard to the policy of the Admiralty, and it was desirable that it should not be, because the Government and the Admiralty must take the responsibility for the policy. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwick from the beginning observed a correct attitude; he expressed no opinion on the requirements of the Navy, but proceeded at once to deal with the difficulty the Admiralty had placed before him. The First Lord, in his statement, had passed a very high eulogy on the hon. Baronet for his work, and undoubtedly anyone who carefully read the Report would admit that the praise was deserved. When they came to examine the Report they had at the very threshold to face one great difficulty—that was that a number of the clauses were merely represented by asterisks, and those clauses referred to the most interesting and difficult questions. No doubt it was not considered right to publish the information embodied in those clauses. But that meant that the Report could not be fully discussed, and the responsibility must rest with the Government. It would have been better to furnish no Report at all than to furnish one from which all the most important details were excluded. Still the Report gave some most valuable information. It showed that during the last sixteen or seventeen years the number of men on active service in the Navy had increased by 52,000, while the Reserves showed an addition of 14,000 or 15,000. That gave them a total force available in any moment of emergency in this country of 162,000 men for the Navy. The Report went on to inquire what were the sources from which some still larger force, irrespective of the proposed increase this year, was to be obtained. As far as he could make out it indicated that there was in the mercantile service a force of not less than about 160,000 sailors—excluding, of course, foreigners and Lascars, from which further recruits might be drawn, if the nation were plunged into an emergency. In addition to that the fishermen would supply a further line of reserve, and thus they would get a force of nearly 200,000 more men from which, in case of emergency, most useful recruits might be drawn. Thus the present position was not of a very disquieting character. But by far the most interesting part of the Report was the extraordinary diagram which appeared on its last page. That diagram gave a most graphic and interesting history of the Navy. It was arranged in the shape of a curved line, and it showed the history of the naval force of this country for a period of 150 years. One would have thought from the speech of the Secretary to the Admiralty, when he declared that he was proposing the largest Estimates ever presented in peace or war, that this year's total represented the largest number of men ever provided for the Navy. That was not so, for in 1801 no fewer than 130,000 men were voted by the House, and in 1810 the total was 146,000 men. No doubt these were gigantic figures, especially when considered in their proportion to the population at the time, but they illustrated what great effort the country was capable of making in an emergency. The diagram showed more; it proved that immediately the emergency had passed the greatest possible relief was instantly given to the country.

Their great quarrel with the present Government was that it now refused to extend the slightest relief to the country although the war was over. Let him remind the House what had been done in this direction in past periods. In the year 1760, at the close of the war with France and Spain, there was a reduction from 70,000 to 16,000; in 1784, at the close of the American war and the war with Spain, it fell from 110,000 to 18,000, and in the four years which succeeded 1813 the Estimate of 146,000 was reduced to 20,000. As late as the year 1860 the Estimates were reduced from 84,000 to 60,000. That illustrated the fact that in every past period the Government of the country did undoubtedly make ample calls on the nation in the moment of emergency, but directly the emergency was over they gave every relief. There was an idea current that the Navy was in an unsatisfactory state in the year 1885. That was before the new policy was adopted, but looking to the diagram to which he had already referred, and comparing the various peace establishments of the past 150 years, it could not be suggested that there was any room whatever for discontent. In the year 1820 the peace establishment of the Navy was 20,000 men; in 1850 it was 40,000; and in 1880 it had risen to 60,000. Thus up to 1885 the growth of the peace establishment was proportionate to the growth of the population and wealth of the country. He thought they had accepted too readily the argument presented to them by the Navy League and the jingoes that the increase was absolutely necessary. He thought, however, that it was abundantly made clear that the present undue rise was quite unnecessary; and he should like to ask the Government which had raised the number of men from 60,000 to 120,000 this question. Were these Estimates of peace or of war? If they were peace Estimates—and he suggested that he was entitled to assume that they were—then an outrageous burden should not be placed on the country without giving some good reasons for it. If they were war Estimates, then he asked why the Government had not followed the universal precedent and, when the war was over, reduced the establishment of the Navy?

The report with which he had been dealing referred to the fact that there had been no inquiry of the character it was called upon to make since 1859, but in that year a Committee was appointed to consider the question of the manning of the Navy, and to discuss the very questions which has been referred to the Committee of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Berwick. The findings of the Committee of 1859 were very similar to the findings of the present Committee, but no attention whatever was paid to their recommendations, and the increase which it recommended both in the Navy and in the Reserve never really took place. It would be very interesting to know if the Committee which had just sat were allowed to inquire why the recommendations of the Committee of 1859 were not adopted. I will venture to state the reason. While the Committee of 1859 was making its inquiries there was a Member of this House named Mr. Richard Cobden, who was preparing a pamphlet on the Navy, which he published under the title of "The Three Panics." Mr. Cobden pointed out that since 1846 a great increase had taken place in the Navy Estimates under the influence of three national movements, which he described as panics. He argued that there had been no real reason for the great increase in expenditure, and pointed to the necessity of entering into negotiations with foreign Powers, and cultivating friendly relations with them in order to stop the continual increases which were going on. On consideration the nation and Parliament decided to adopt the policy of Mr. Cobden. In 1860 the celebrated Commercial Treaty with France was entered into, and some twenty treaties upon a commercial basis were consummated between this country and other foreign nations about that time. In the period immediately following 1860 there was a reduction of 25,000 in the number of men, and during the quarter of a century after that time there occurred the greatest development in the resources of this country which they had ever experienced. It seemed to him that the sudden increases in Naval expenditure during the last fifteen years were very like those Mr. Cobden described. The Government had again assumed a defiant attitude towards other nations, and were needlessly building up these huge armaments. The Government ought to look more fully into this ancient history and imitate the examples set them by the Government of 1860. He had asked for some reason why the increases had been made this year, and the only reply they got was a querulous inquiry "Why don't you talk about a detail?" They did not want to discuss items or to go into detail, but they did want to know something of the principle upon which the Government were proceeding. He thought upon this occasion mere courtesy should induce the hon. Member in charge to state why this year had been picked out for such a large increase in the expenditure and in the number of men. In all the recent elections the question of this increased expenditure had been brought to the front with the result that the Government candidates were placed at the bottom of the poll.

If the Government knew what was going on outside, and the state of affairs, they would at once realise the gravity of the situation. Money was difficult to find now for any new business enterprises, wages were falling, and pauperism was increasing, and yet during such times the Government increased their Estimates for the Army and Navy. There was a great responsibility upon hon. Members on the Opposition sides in regard to the question, for many of them had shown great reluctance to vote against an increase in the Navy Estimates. In a celebrated speech at Bristol the late Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that if any increase of the Navy were proposed by the Government this Spring, after the efforts made during the last ten years, then the Estimates would have to be treated in a very different way to what they had been treated during recent years. The last word of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer was to warn the Government against this increase of expenditure. They required some vindication of the policy which the Government had adopted. After the emergency through which the nation had passed they wished to know why the Government had refused to give them this information. He begged to move the Motion standing in his name.

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said he desired to second the Motion. They had been told that the Committee of Defence was to be reorganised because it was felt that there was no concord between the Army and Navy authorities, and because it was thought necessary that they should look into what ought to be spent on the Army and on the Navy respectively. It was extraordinary that before that Committee had had an opportunity of seeing exactly what was needed for the Army and the Navy the Government should rush into this new expenditure. If it were true that the Navy required this new increase now, what were they to say about the Government for not proposing it last year? They had just added 27,000 men to the Army, not only against the united protest of hon. Members on the Opposition side, but also against the protest of a large number of hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Ministerial side of the House. Recent elections had ratified the protests made in the House, but if they chose in this reckless manner to add 27,000 men to the Army surely it was a bad moment to add also to the Navy. His hon. friend had asked why the Government did not follow the precedents of former times and reduce the armaments when they came to the end of a war. It was simply because the Government had come to the conclusion, since Imperialism had been in the ascendency, that all the great Ministers who had had the destinies of this nation in hand before the present Government came into power, were nothing but idiots and fools, and the Government had decided that it was necessary to keep up armaments sufficient to fight the whole world. They had got to accept the fact that if this country went to war they could not control the entire seas, or block up all the navies of their enemies, and they would necessarily have to submit to a considerable loss in trade. He was not sure that such a calamity would not be a good thing for the country, because all countries were too apt to recklessly plunge into war. All the promises and assurances made that this country was going to better its position by the late war in South Africa had not proved correct.

It had been suggested that they should make an appeal to other great Naval Powers to come to some arrangement in regard to the strength of their Navy. Those suggestions were not practical if based upon the present balance of power, because it practically meant saying to other countries: "We want permanently to assume the position of being masters of the sea, and therefore you must have a Navy not able, with two or three other navies joined to it, to defeat the British Navy." No foreign country would accept such a scheme. Napoleon sought universal Empire, and the whole world united against him. Although this country had more colonies than foreign countries they must not forget that foreign countries also had their carrying trade, and they had realised that it was necessary for all manufacturing nations to be able to export their goods. Consequently they would never assent to a claim that their colonies and trade should be held as kind of hostages by this country. It was often urged that they must have command of the sea in order to ensure their food supply. He denied, in the first place, that it was necessary for them to obtain command of the sea in such a way. This country might build ships, and foreign countries might also build, but although England had a long purse, it was not longer than the rest of the world. He did not think it necessary, in order to obtain food supplies, that we should be in such a position. Supposing we were at war with France, Germany, and Russia, we should get our provisions from America. Why? Because the Americans would claim that they had a perfect right to send food here; they would not accept the doctrine that food was contraband of war. Then these three Powers would know that they would have the United States against them if they attempted to enforce any such doctrine.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): What would happen if the United States refused to accept that view?

Mr. LABOUCHERE said he was waiting for that question. He was looking to the hon. Gentleman to ask it. The United States refused to accept the doctrine laid down by the Treaty of Paris, and had invariably asserted the view he had stated. Did his hon. friend seriously suppose that if we were in the contingency of war he had suggested in Europe, that the United States would for a moment accept the view that their ships might be overhauled in the open ocean in order to see whether they had food which was destined for us? The United States depended enormously on their export of wheat, and they would not agree for a moment that they should be hindered on the ground that they had not entered into a particular treaty, or that our enemies chose to assert that food was contraband of war.

Sir FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley): What would happen if they refused to send us food?

Mr. LABOUCHERE said that was the sort of idle, silly question that a woman would ask. It was the sort of possibility that hon. Gentlemen were always putting forward, calling upon the House to spend hard cash in order to avoid contingencies that could not reasonably be expected to happen. Suppose we were at war with all the European countries he had named and the United States as well, what would be our position? We might have command of the sea, but these countries would only have to wait and they would starve us out. Our command of the sea would do us no good.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: We don't get all our food from the United States.

MR. LABOUCHERE asked whether, in the event of the countries that might be opposed to us forbidding their own exports, anybody seriously supposed they would allow the Argentine Republic to send us food supplies and so defeat their scheme of starving us out? The whole thing was mythical. We were always nowadays imagining some possible danger so that we might spend a certain number of millions in order to avoid it. That was called being patriotic, and anybody who opposed it was called a traitor. He was quite willing to be called a traitor when he had such company as Peel and Cobden, who entertained the same views.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said that Cobden stated that if it were necessary to spend £100,000,000 on the Navy for the protection of our trade and commerce, we would be making a cheap expenditure.

MR. LABOUCHERE said he had heard that often said, but he had never met anyone who could state where Mr. Cobden said it. If the hon. Member could show where the statement was made he would confer a service, because they were all curious to know. But whether he said it or not there was an "if" in the matter, and his reply was that it would not cost £100,000,000. Did anyone suppose that if in a concrete form a proposal had come before the House to vote £100,000,000 in order to make sure of our getting our food in time of war, that Mr. Cobden, who always opposed an increase of armaments, would have spoken and voted in favour of the proposal. Hon. Gentlemen knew very well, although they tried to twist in Mr. Cobden as a supporter of their policy, that he would have been one of the very first to move a reduction of £95,000,000. We were on a wrong basis entirely when we said that we must have a Navy equal to those of two or three Powers. It was a challenge thrown down to all the world, and what had been the consequence? The world had to meet the challenge, and each separate country had made additions to its Navy. The consequence was that at the present moment the relative proportion of strength between us and foreign nations in regard to the Navy was very much the same as it was before we began this wild scheme of "beggar my neighbour." He put his opposition on the ground that the Defence Committee was sitting at the present moment, and that it was foolish on our part to increase the expenses of the Army or Navy until they had before them the united plan of the Army and Navy authorities for the maintenance of the safety of this country. That, he thought, would in itself be a sufficient reason, but he put it on two other grounds. One was what his hon. friend had shown, namely that after a great war we ought to have a pausing time in the increase of armaments, and considering that we had already to pay interest on the amount we had borrowed for the recent war, and also for the large sums which were yet to be paid, we ought to wait for a year or two. His firm belief was that they could not devote to the payment of sailors money which they had already agreed to expend on soldiers. The House had already agreed to an expenditure on 27,000 extra men for the Army. They knew perfectly well that most hon. Gentlemen opposite were opposed to that expenditure. Some of them voted against it, and some of them walked out of the House and would not vote in favour of it, and others shrugged their shoulders in a guilty sort of a way, and simply because they did not like to vote against their Party went into the lobby and voted against their consciences. In these circumstances he would vote with his hon. friend if he went to a division.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out '127,100,' and insert '122,500.'"—(*Mr. Lough*).

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Resolution:"

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY said the hon. Member for Northampton had only adduced two arguments in favour of the reduction of the Vote. The hon. Member founded his case almost entirely on the suggestion that America would not agree that food should be regarded as contraband of war, and that if American ships were carrying food to this country, and the enemies of this country were to overhaul those ships for the purpose of capturing that food, America would not agree to it. That seemed to be an entirely convincing argument to the hon. Member. He ventured to ask the hon. Member what would happen supposing America did not agree with his view, and his answer was that that was a silly interpellation. But even if America with such powers at sea as she possessed did not agree that contraband of war included food intended for this country, we would have no power to enforce her non-agreement; and a powerful country—it might be France, Russia or Germany, or all three—would insist on carrying on this examination of vessels carrying food for this country, whether the American nation agreed or not. Therefore, the non-concurrence of America had really nothing to do with the case, and they were brought back to the question whether we had sufficient provision of the physical kind—sufficient strength of arm to protect ourselves. On that, and on that only, we must rely. We had it on absolute authority that we had no more than a fortnight's supply of food in this country. That might, on short rations, last for six weeks before the people were starved into submission without firing a shot. The Admiralty, in the provision they were making, seemed to him to be acting wisely in dealing largely with cruisers.

The hon. Member for West Islington, in arguing that the Estimates should be cut down, instanced what was brought before the Committee presided over by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwick for the purpose of showing that on former occasions, when a war was over, naval preparations not only ceased but actually were reduced. The hon. Member invited the House to accept that information as something which should govern operations at the present time. He asked the hon. Member to consider that on former occasions the enemies of this country at sea had been crushed as the result of war, and, therefore, it was not necessary to go on with preparations. At that time there was only one maritime enemy of this country—namely, France. The war just concluded was a war in which we had not a maritime Power to face, and the result of that war had not yet affected in the least degree the possible opponents we might have to meet at sea. Therefore, the parallel which the hon. Member sought to draw entirely failed; and, however prudent it might have been many years ago to reduce naval preparations when a prolonged naval war had paralysed our resources, there was no reason whatever why a similar state of things should prevail in the future. The position was clear. The German Emperor, taking a profound interest in his Navy, had placed in the hands of the members of the Reichstag a comparative list of the ships of the British Navy and of the German Navy. The enormous increase in the Naval Estimates in Germany had been accepted, notwithstanding some reductions, by the German Parliament. President Roosevelt had stated to the Senate of the United States and to the country that the time had now come for America to be a world Power, and naval preparations on a very large scale were being carried out in the United States. Russia was continuing her preparations, and France was not behind. It would, therefore, be criminal on the part of this country if we did not make corresponding preparations. He believed that the Motion would fall to the ground without the shock which the hon Member believed he was inflicting on the House. The feeling of the House and the country was that of complete conviction that the life and future existence of this country as a Power and as a nation depended upon the sufficiency and completeness of our naval preparations.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) said that the hon. Member who had just sat down had made a very interesting contribution—he had made it before—to the general principle that this country ought to be sufficiently armed for warfare on the sea. That was not disputed here. The real subject of consideration was whether it was not possible to have some alleviation of the enormous burdens at present laid on the people of the country. This was, after all, an assembly whose business it was to attack questions of this kind in a business sense, and with all respect to the hon. Gentleman, he did not think that it furthered the inquiry by alluding so often to a principle on which all were agreed. There was a certain unreality with regard to most debates on the Estimates It was very difficult to cut them down. The right hon. Gentleman responsible for the Army Estimates said "Tell me where you can cut these Estimates down"—and he showed the House a book an inch thick. How was it possible for any private Member, or any person not conversant with the full details of all that went on at the Admiralty, to say what item should be cut down? If that argument was to prevail, it would prevent all useful criticism of expenditure in this House. There had been speculations on the contingencies of this country being engaged in war, of not having the complete command of the sea, and our not being able to be supplied with food from America. He would not enter into the extraordinarily difficult questions that arise out of that; but he would make one observation. The United States Government had, for many years, been urging that private property at sea ought to be respected in time of war the same as private property on land. On that point the hon. Member for Northampton had been challenged by the hon. Member for King's Lynn, who had written a book on the subject very full of information. But it was well worth consideration whether the conditions of naval warfare, in reference to the capture of private property at sea, should not be revised by this country in view of the increase of naval expenditure in this and other countries. We should not then be under the fear, we now were in, lest we should be starved out on account of our inability to get food. It was of the utmost importance, with a view to that danger, to maintain as strongly as we could two doctrines. One was that food supplies, except in the case of effective blockade, were not contraband of war. He did not think that our statesmen had yet realised the importance of that doctrine. The second was, whether we should not accede to the doctrine laid down by the United States in regard to private property at sea?

He would further point out that many speeches had been made on the subject of the Naval Estimates, but the House had not received from the Government what they had asked for—any reason whatever for any increase of expenditure on the Naval Estimates of this year. The increase was very large. He had the utmost reluctance in voting against Estimates presented on the responsibility of the Government of the day, but the House of Commons ought to be told whether there were any particular reasons of policy—without prying unduly into them—which dictated so large an increase in this year's Estimates. There was one other matter. There was no means by which they could be enabled to judge what was the proper policy of this country in regard to naval armaments. They ought to be in a position to know what were the relative strengths—he would not say in ships, because they were not competent to judge of that—but the relative sums spent by this and other countries on naval armaments. He believed that a Return recently made contained a description of the ships afloat; but experts, with these figures before them, were liable to differ from each other as to the value of the comparison. It all depended upon the strength of the ships, or upon this, that, and the other particular which a private person was quite unable to judge of. But there was one method of gaining useful information and aiding their judgment which they did not possess at the present moment. If an official Return were presented of the sums of money spent during the last ten or twelve years by France, Germany, Russia and the United States on naval armaments they would be able to form some opinion on two points—First: What was our probable relative strength compared with that of other Powers, assuming the money went the same length; and second: Who was it who began this race of expenditure? He had looked at the figures so far as they were accessible to him, and he was sorry to say that this country had something to do with the beginning of this race in enormous expenditure. It told against this country more than against any other, because our particular needs absolutely required that we should be sufficiently prepared; whereas it was more or less of a luxury with the other Powers, unless it were for the purposes of aggression. It was therefore most important to be able to follow in an intelligent manner the expenditure of the other Powers, and to estimate who were the people who proposed this race, and how it fared with this country in the struggle. He believed that after ten years of expenditure on competitive armaments this country was, relatively speaking, weaker than it was ten years ago; and that the whole of our money had been wasted, and worse than wasted. If that were the case, if we had doubled our Naval expenditure in ten years, if we, by reason of that increased expenditure, had induced other Powers to increase their expenditure, it would have been better on all hands had the whole of the money been thrown into the sea. [Laughter from hon. Members on the GOVERNMENT Benches.] Hon. Gentlemen opposite did not do justice to his argument. Of course he was assuming that if we did not go on, the other Powers would not go on. [Renewed laughter from the GOVERNMENT Benches.] He hoped hon. Gentlemen opposite would not trifle with the argument, which he maintained was a very intelligent one.

There was one other matter. It had been stated by the hon. Member for Northampton that we ought to make an approach to the other Powers, or at all events to avail ourselves of every opportunity—which he (the hon. and learned Member for Dumfries Burghs) had some grounds to think would be readily offered — to see whether we could not secure that there should be a diminution of, or a limit to, Naval expenditure all round. The hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty, on the occasion of the last debate, said that that had been done, and that what had been done by a prudent and wise Government should not be regarded with derision by hon. Gentlemen opposite. He did not, however, quite understand the language used by the hon. Gentleman, and he would therefore ask him for further information on the subject. Mr. Goschen suggested some years ago that he was prepared to abate some of the new construction programme of this country if Russia did the same. He was not aware whether any negotiations had taken place, or whether there had been any communications on the subject; and he should be obliged if the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty would tell the House whether there had been any such negotiations within the last six or seven years; and if so, whether he would lay Papers on the Table showing what had been done. He believed that other Powers would be prepared, in one form and another, to agree that this country should have what she was legitimately entitled to claim, a position of sufficient strength to secure her safety and security on the seas. Otherwise it would, of course, be impossible to come to any terms at all. But other Powers would only be prepared to agree if they believed that the power of this country on the seas would not be used for aggressive purposes, and if they had faith in the pacific disposition of this country.

The fact was everyone was agreed that this country must have adequate and full naval strength; and, for that reason, he was not disposed to put difficulties in the way of the Government. But he thought it was a false and mistaken patriotism altogether to ignore the difficulties that lay in the way of providing further funds for naval or military armaments. That would be foolish, and would tend to defeat their own purpose, as it was certain that when the pressure of very heavy taxation came upon the people, they would insist upon economy, and economy might then not be either in the right direction or at the right stage. That was the reason why he strongly urged on the Government all the considerations he had laid before them. It was lamentable that these debates did not attract the presence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or First Lord of the Treasury, or of any member of the Naval Defence Committee, although they were being asked to vote enormous Estimates, amounting to £34,500,000, to say nothing of Naval Works, which would amount to £2,500,000 more. It was deplorable that the House and the country did not face the real difficulties and the real dangers in this matter; and that they were not prepared to use all reasonable means to reduce expenditure. He was perfectly certain there was only one way to do this, and that was to keep pegging away in the House of Commons and in the country until people came to realise the enormity of this expenditure, the vast degree in which it had increased within ten years, and the great probability that, unless the House of Commons interposed it would go on increasing, until it was brought down with a run which would not be consonant with the feelings of this country.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said he quite agreed with the hon. Gentleman that the enormous increase in the national expenditure was a matter which deserved the consideration of this country. It was not necessary in order to ensure a reduction that they should harp on the subject in this House, because he thought it was receiving most serious attention in the country, and that recent events were largely due to the disinclination the English people now felt, the war being over, to continue, in any degree, the expenditure they were willing to face while the war was in progress. He would ask permission to say one word on the question of food supply, in reply to what had been said by the hon. Member for Northampton. The hon. Member said that the food supply of the country in time of war would not be interfered with, because the United States would not allow interference with its ships.

MR. LABOUCHERE said that he did not state the food supply would not be interfered with; he said that the country would not be starved out, and he was perfectly certain that the country would get all the food it required.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that the contention of the hon. Gentleman was that they would get an adequate supply, because the United States would not allow corn to be taken out of United States vessels. He thought the hon. Gentleman was under a misapprehension. He would remind the House that the rule of naval warfare, under which they now lived, and which was agreed to in 1856, was that a neutral flag covered the cargo, except contraband of war. Take the case of corn consigned to an English merchant in an American ship. The question would arise whether it was, or was not, under the rule to which he referred, capturable by France. But the United States had not agreed to the rule, they refused to sign it, although they were prepared to go further. Consequently, who then would protest against France seizing English corn in an American vessel? The United States would not suffer, as the ship would be released. England might have cause for complaint, because England had agreed to the rule under which a neutral flag covered the cargo. But France had also agreed to that rule; and therefore it would not be competent for France to seize English goods in an American ship. Then came the question as to whether corn was contraband of war.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! This does not relate to the question of the number of men to be voted for the Navy. The attitude of the United States was referred to as the justification for an increase in the Navy; but that does not allow hon. Members to enter into a discussion as to what is the true view of a question of international law.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said, of course, he would bow to the ruling of the Chair; but it was extremely unfortunate that an incorrect doctrine with reference to international law should be preached in this House; and that it was against the Rules of Order to reply to it. The hon. Member for the Shipley Division said that the country would be starved out without striking a blow, because corn would be regarded as contraband of war. He did not think that the country could be starved out without striking a blow. Hon. Members who held that opinion had only to look at the map of Europe. If they did they would see that the sea avenues to this country were so numerous and so wide that it would be physically impossible for all the navies of the world to stop the influx of corn into these Islands. It would mean the shutting up of the seas from the Naze to the Orkneys, from the Orkneys to the North of Ireland, all the West Coast of Ireland, and from Cape Clear to Ushant. That would be physically impossible. Whatever the strength of the enemy might be, the food supply of this country was quite safe; because it was absolutely impossible to close all the sea doors to this country. The hon. Member for West Islington said that the number of men the House was asked to vote was unjustifiable in present circumstances, because after a war the Navy had always been largely reduced. No doubt that was the fact in 1784, but in 1791–2 the Fleet was increased as much as it had been previously reduced. Again in 1802 the number of men was reduced enormously, but there was an increase almost immediately. The result was that there was a steep reduction and a steep increase; and the moral was that these steep reductions and steep increases were possible in other days but were not possible now. In other days there was no continuous service, nor did the country require it, because the men taken from the mercantile marine were just as good to fight a man-of-war as anyone that could be trained. The system in those days was that where there was a captain who had a reputation for securing prize money he got a crew immediately, but where there was a captain who had a contrary reputation, he found great difficulty in getting a crew. After the war the men went back to the mercantile marine and the Navy almost ceased to be. That was not possible now. The mercantile marine men would not suffice. They could not man the Navy; and, with regard to the Naval Reserve, he was perfectly persuaded that they could not introduce more than 25 per cent. into a battleship, owing to their ignorance of the ways and practices aboard a man-of-war. It was continuous service that had made all the difference. With continuous service they could not make a tremendous reduction at the end of a war, or a tremendous increase when a war broke out. Consequently any comparison between olden times and the present day was absolutely out of place.

* MR. LOUGH asked if the Committee which inquired into the matter did not recommend an experiment with non-continuous service.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that the Committee stated that they were impressed with the importance of maintaining unimpaired the present condition of service. He, and everyone who had considered the Navy, were also impressed with the great importance of continuous service. The hon. Gentleman referred to the number of men available to build up the Naval Reserve. That number was indeed very large. He had made careful calculations himself, and he was convinced that there were at least 500,000 British seamen, including a large number of men not included in the Board of Trade Returns of mercantile marine seamen. He would undertake to prove that there were 500,000 British-born seamen ready to be called upon to form a Naval Reserve. He was glad to see that the Naval Reserve was to be increased. It corresponded to the Militia; and he should be glad to see it extended, as far as possible, to the decrease, if necessary, of continuous service men; but it was very difficult to draft a reserve man into a man-of-war and get full service out of him immediately.

The hon. Gentleman opposite believed that by some arrangement with foreign countries they might be able to diminish the Navy. He would not accept any such arrangement, even if it were offered, though he would accept it with reference to the Army. With all the responsibility which rested on the administration of the country, he could not believe that it would be safe to diminish the Navy. He would also point out that the Navy was essentially a non-aggressive force. The Navy was not a force for conquest, but mainly a force for defence. Without suggesting that the amount of the Estimates was in itself a matter requiring justification, he did think that the Government had not shown that trust in the Navy which would justify these large Estimates. The whole of the power of this country had been shown in the Navy. It was the Navy alone which enabled us to deal with the great combination formed against us by Napoleon. That in itself was a justification for our having a large Navy. In the years from 1809 to 1812, when the whole of the Continent was against us, it was the Navy, and the Navy alone, which, by strangling the trade of the Continent, succeeded in discouraging, one by one, the Powers allied with Napoleon, and made them ally themselves with us. His complaint against the Government was that they seemed to have lost trust in the Navy. They even sought to destroy the character of the very officers whom they asked the House to vote by the hasty adoption of new plans.

*MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) said that, heavy as they all felt the Estimates for the year to be, there was a general feeling on the Opposition side, as well as on the Ministerial, that a reduction might have been made in the men for the Army with greater satisfaction than in the men for the Navy. The hon. Member for Islington (Mr. Lough) had indeed been unfortunate in the choice of the opportunities he had taken to protest against our increasing expenditure.

*MR. LOUGH, interposing, said he had protested against the increased expenditure for both Services.

*MR. RUNCIMAN said the hon. Gentleman would have done better if he had turned the whole force of his energy to the reduction of expenditure on the Army, rather than make these unfortunate appearances—if he might call them so—on the Navy Estimates. Mr. Cobden had been largely quoted in the debate, but he doubted very much whether Mr. Cobden would at any time have attempted to reduce the number of men necessary to man our ships. It was true that a large number of men had been added to the Army this year, but that was no reason for reducing the number of men in our Navy. His hon. friend had referred to the large reductions possible at the conclusion of the wars in the early part of the last century, and at the end of the 18th century, but it had been well pointed out that the circumstances now were altogether different. If we were to attempt anything of that kind now we should not only leave a large portion of our Fleet entirely unmanned, but be placing it in such a position that it would be impossible to mobilise in a few weeks, or even in a few months, and, moreover, we should find ourselves responsible for a new addition to the unemployed. What he wanted to know was the standard up to which the Admiralty was now working—were they working up to a two or a three-Power standard? Taking the table issued by the Admiralty last June we were below the three-Power standard. He also found that from the table issued by Beyer, of Berlin, at the beginning of this year, we were under the three-Power standard, while in 1907, when Germany would have largely increased her Fleet and be in a relatively strong position, her number of battleships——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I think this would come rather on the Shipbuilding Vote than on the question of men. No doubt the number of men is connected with the number of ships, but the hon. Member is now going into a comparison with the number of ships of foreign navies.

*MR. RUNCIMAN said he bowed entirely to the Speaker's ruling. He desired to know from the Government the standard they were adopting in order that they might judge how far the increase of men was necessary. He would, however, drop the subject for the moment. He thought the Vote before the House, so far from being too large, was altogether too small. The increase in men was not only necessary for the new programme, but some vessels under Lord Spencer's programme had only recently been added to the Navy, and these alone required an additional number of men. When they were told that the sources from which they could draw their men were by no means small, and that they could call upon the merchant service for help in time of war, the Admiralty would be well advised to study the Report of the recent Committee, which distinctly stated that the mercantile service could not be looked upon as a source on which they could draw in time of war. That was a decision on which the Committee were to be congratulated. There was, indeed, an enormous number of fishermen who might be utilised, but they now would have to be allowed to a large extent to continue their avocations in time of war. They provided the cheapest form of food for the poorer people of the country, and it was hardly reasonable to expect that this source should be depleted to the extent of many thousands of men. At all events the fishing services, especially those on the Newfoundland Banks, provided a great source on which they could draw for the necessary elastic increase which must take place in time of war. On a peace-footing it was necessary we should be able to mobilise our fleets without depleting the merchant service or other services which would provide the food supplies of this country. He did not know that numbers were the only standard by which Admiralty work should be judged. Representatives of the Admiralty asked for large Estimates. From his short experience of the House he noticed that the larger the Estimates the prouder was the representative of the Admiralty. It did not, however, take a genius to spend money, but it was necessary that men should have great ability to spend it well. He would urge upon the Admiralty that, as they were making a large increase to the Fleet, they should see that the Fleet was well equipped, and as they were making a large increase of men, they should see that they were well trained. He would never do anything to decrease the number of men necessary for the full manning of the Fleet so long as he suspected they required every man now asked for, or rather more, to make it efficient.

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast) said that although the Motion was one to reduce by 4,000 the number of men asked for in the Vote, the House had had a discussion upon history, political economy, and naval policy, which had gone far outside the question of reduction, and he would perhaps be pardoned if he did not follow hon. Members in all the excursions they had made. The mover of the Amendment had asked what was the justification for the increase in the Votes generally, and in this Vote in particular. On a previous occasion he had pointed out the enormously increased cost of the ships and the great exertions that were being made by other countries in the way of shipbuilding, and he could now give an explanation with regard to the men which he thought would carry conviction, at any rate, as far as the Vote this year went. Every additional man for which the Admiralty were asking was being voted in pursuance of a regular actuarial study of the requirements of the Navy, and for the purpose of manning the ships already voted by the House, most of which were in progress of construction. This was not, as seemed to be supposed, a spasmodic series of actions on the part of the Admiralty. The standard to which they were working was that to which, as far as he knew, they had worked for many years past — a standard which had been often enjoined upon them by the House of Commons, viz., that of putting the Navy in such a condition as to be able successfully to contend with any two other naval Powers. These matters could not be judged offhand by taking a list of the ships. We had to defend our interests in many places and under circumstances which did not attend the naval operations of any other Power. While our risks were far spread, those of other countries were concentrated. The hon. and learned Member for Dumfries had said that the matter could be tested by the expenditure. But exact official returns of the naval expenditure of other countries could not be given. In many countries the naval expenditure did not correspond with the amount which appeared in their published Estimates, and in addition to that, our naval expenditure included many things which were not at all necessary for other countries, and did not appear on their Naval Votes at all. For instance, no one would contend that the naval expenditure of Germany, with her fleet concentrated at two ports, and two alone—in the North Sea and the Baltic—could have any actual correspondence with that of this country, which had to maintain fleets in the Channel, the Mediterranean, and on the North American coast and to provide depôts, arsenals, and docks for those fleets. Therefore, even if an accurate estimate of the cost could be prepared, it would not be a fair criterion. But so far as it was a question of number, if the administration was to be trusted at all, it must be left to the Admiralty to decide the force needed under the conditions stated to combat successfully any force that might be opposed to us.

The hon. Member for Islington had asked what was to be the limit of the number of men, and why a reduction could not be made. In the report to which the hon. member had referred there was an indication of the method by which it was hoped some alteration would be secured. It was there suggested that non-continuous service should be introduced under proper precautions, and to a limited extent. The hon. Member, however, had not stated the reasons given in the Report why the suggestion could not be carried out at once in its entirety. The Committee agreed that the increase of the active service ratings must be continued until the necessary minimum of active service ratings for the war fleet had been reached. That was the key of the whole situation. Everyone agreed that it was a moderate and reasonable calculation as to the number of men who must be active service ratings in each ship on mobilisation. The Admiralty knew the number of ships they had, and the number they would have at a given date, and they knew the number of active service ratings they would have without any further increase to provide the crews for those ships. It was the intention of the Admiralty from time to time to make such additions to the active service ratings as would enable them to put a crew on each ship on mobilisation, having active service ratings and non-continuous service men in their proper proportions. The hon. Member for Dewsbury had asked why the Admiralty were not relying on the mercantile marine, particularly mentioning the fishermen.

MR. RUNCIMAN said he had not urged that in the least. He rather welcomed the decision of the Committee not to rely on the mercantile marine, and suggested that although the fisheries were a very good source, they ought not to be too largely drawn upon.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said the Committee had pointed out that the mercantile marine was a very suitable source from which to draw a portion of the reserves, and that they desired to make the sources from which reserves could be drawn still wider. He entirely disagreed with the hon. Member for West Islington as to the conclusions to be drawn from the table at the end of the Report. If he had read the Report side by side with the history of England, he would have put an entirely different construction upon it. It was true that in 1815, after the Congress of Vienna, the Navy was enormously reduced, but it had to be remembered that at that time there was no other navy in existence; we were supreme without a rival on the seas. As to 1859, the hon. Member dragged in the name of Mr. Cobden, who, he said, passed a number of commercial treaties by which it was made possible to reduce the Navy still further. But 1859 was the very year in which France laid down her first armoured battleship, and started the movement in favour of increasing the Fleets of Europe. With regard to what the hon. Member for Northampton stated, he did not think he needed to dwell upon his contribution, which appeared to him to be purely of a debating character. The hon. Member, however, did confirm one theory which he would like to say a word about. The hon. Member for Northampton said it was really all their own fault that foreign nations, seeing this country embarking upon a wild shipbuilding programme, followed in their footsteps; and he further said that foreign statesmen could not go before their country and adopt any other course when they saw their colonies and their trade threatened with extinction by any other nation. That was exactly his own position, for he was not able to go before his countrymen and contemplate the loss of our colonies. He would go further and say that their colonies were a great deal more important to this country than the colonies of any other country in the world.

The hon. and learned Member for Dumfries asked what was his authority for saying that they had made proposals. When he was speaking the other night about offers and suggestions that had been made he was speaking of the public announcement made at the Table of the House by the First Lord of the Admiralty upon a peculiar occasion when a foreign country was starting a new and enormous development in time of peace without any apparent reason, and when they were building a very formidable class of ship. In the middle of a Parliamentary Session the First Lord of the Admiralty thought it necessary to come to Parliament and say to his Government that he could not allow this addition to be made to the Navy of Russia without taking some corresponding step. He admitted that that was not an official communication to put before a Government, but he was not in a position to say that representations were made to foreign Governments. He thought, however, that the words of the First Lord of the Admiralty gave an intimation to foreign countries throughout the world.

*MR. LOUGH: To the extent to which that goes.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes, of course. He came back now to this question of the men. He invited hon. Members to read the Report of the right hon. Baronet's Commission, which gave a very fair statement of the problems and conditions attending the manning of the Navy. They would then see the principle upon which the Government were attempting to meet a very serious responsibility, and they would recognise that there was now for the first time for many years a definite proposal for relieving the strain of the men. In justice to this Committee and to the Admiralty this should not be passed by. It ought to have a very great effect upon the strain of manning the Navy. In the first place there was the introduction of the Volunteer forces and the non-continuous service plan, which would give them an exceedingly well trained class of men in time, who would be enlisted in the service, but who would be available for active rating and active service on mobilisation. There were other sources such as the Fleet Reserve When they were attacked, as they had been attacked that afternoon, for adding 4,000 men of all ratings to the Navy, he thought they should be given some credit for this *bonâ fide* attempt to relieve the country of this great strain. He expressed his regret that the hon. Member for Dewsbury thought it necessary to say that he had looked at these matters with a light heart and with a pride in accordance with their magnitude. He thought he had done his best to explain as to that.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said there was one disadvantage connected with this debate which it seemed impossible to get rid of. His hon. friend proposed to strike out the increase for this year in the men because they were not necessary, and because the Navy Estimates were too large already to justify it. He thought the answer was that the increase proposed this year had no connection with the increase in the Naval programme generally. They wanted these 4,700 men because three or four or five years ago they increased the number of their ships. If they built new ships they must find the men necessary to man them. The question was whether this number of men was necessary to man the new ships that were passing into the Fleet this year, and which had been sanctioned by the Estimates passed five or six years ago. He had criticised the right of the Admiralty to decide the magnitude of the fleet, but when it came to technical problems like the manning of existing ships and the number of active service men necessary, then he felt that he was not in a position to criticise the judgment of the Naval experts. That fact made it difficult for him to support a reduction in this Vote, although he sympathised with the general grounds put forward by the mover of this Motion. But when they came to the other point that this increase was typical of the vast increase in the Navy Estimates which had no special justification, then he was entirely with his hon. friend. As he had an opportunity of stating his views the other day he would not repeat them now, but he would ask those hon. Members who heard his remarks to remember that the size of the Estimates for any particular year was a question of Government policy for this House, and the Secretary to the Admiralty could not give them a conclusive justification of that policy. It appeared to him necessary and proper that the First Lord of the Treasury, as Chairman of the Defence Committee, should be present to advise them upon the great questions of policy which underlay these Estimates.

The real issue was not upon automatic or non-effective Votes like this one on which they could not call upon the Government to defend the Naval Estimates, but rather on the Vote for shipbuilding which contained a vast increase this year and which must involve a corresponding increase in following years. These Estimates were so great that they ought not to accept a comparatively small increase without demurring to it. The Estimates for the Navy had now reached £36,000,000 a year, and the colonies had been given as a reason for that great increase. He thought they were entitled to ask the Government what area they sought to protect by these steps, and what standard they were working up to and what particular justification they had for the particular increase made this year. That justification they had not had from his hon. friend, and he could not give it because it must come from the Government as a whole, and from the head of the Government. The hon. Member for Dumfries and others who had protested against these Estimates had claimed and asserted that it was the duty of this country to make representations to other nations in the direction of arranging a mutual scheme of disarmament. The hon. Member for Shipley jeered at that as a millennial proposal, but it was a proposal to which this country and this Government had already committed themselves. Lord Salisbury undertook obligations in this respect, for upon this point on the 14th of February, 1899; referring to the Russian invitation to consider this question, he said that His Majesty's Government would gladly accept that invitation for a conference to discuss the best methods of attaining the two objects specified, namely, the diminution of armaments all round by land and sea, and the prevention of hostilities by diplomatic negotiation. He would not go into details. He would just give the result as stated by the British representative on that occasion. There was no proposal of general disarmament, or even the limitation of armaments. The object which was put in the forefront in the Czar's circular presented so many difficulties, from the practical point of view, that it was necessarily abandoned for the present. That was not a definite abandonment of the scheme. He wished that the First Lord of the Treasury, as Chairman of the Cabinet Committee of Defence, had done them the honour of listening to this debate. If the right hon. Gentleman had been present, he would have asked him: "Do you hold by Lord Salisbury's expressed determination to bring about disarmament by common consent, and do you accept the statement of Lord Pauncefote that it was only postponed and not abandoned?" If that was the right hon. Gentleman's position, the country would be relieved. He was sorry the House had not the opportunity of hearing an answer to that question from the right hon. Gentleman to-day. The underlying interest in this question was not the number of ships or men, but the financial position into which these great Estimates had gone. Might he just mention the extraordinary fact that seven years ago, when the present Government came into office, the National Debt stood at £660,000,000.

*Mr. SPEAKER said that on the Report Stage of the Vote the hon. Member could generally discuss the increase in the men and consequent increase in the Naval Estimates, but the debate must be confined to that question.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said the debate had been a little difficult. It was relying on Mr. Speaker's leniency that he was going to make a point which he was afraid he could not now make. He would only say that if these Estimates were passed the Government would have spent during seven years on war and warlike expenditure a sum equivalent to the whole National Debt at the time they came into office. He thought that was a reason alone which should make them pause.

MR. LOUGH asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth) said the hon. and learned Member for the Dumfries Burghs complained because a previous Speaker had dealt with the whole question of expenditure, and not with the particular directions in which economy might be practised. He understood from Mr. Speaker's ruling that it was to the general principle and the magnitude of the whole Estimates that they must address themselves. Hon. Members would sympathise with him when he said, as the representative of a naval constituency, that his natural inclination was to advocate a large increase of expenditure on the wages of men. It was in connection with the increased size of the Navy that the question of the number of men arose. The objection raised by hon. Members opposite, he took it, was that if we were going to increase our Navy we would be confronted with what was little short of ruin. The question he desired to ask was that, if that were true, what was going to happen if we did not keep up our Navy to the necessary state of efficiency? In effect the position was—"if we go forward we die, if we go backward we die; better go forward and die." He was sustained by the authority of Dr. Johnson, who said:

> "It is sad to pass through the quagmire of parsimony to the gulf of ruin. To pass over the flowery path of extravagance is very well."

Surely it was premature, and it would be a most dangerous thing, for the House to give in to the objections which had been raised. More than once in the course of this discussion they had been told what Sir Robert Peel said sixty years ago as to the alarming expenditure on naval and military preparations. We were still alarmed at the growth of that expenditure, and he believed the House would continue to hear complaints of the increased expenditure on the Army and Navy. He hoped it would be so, for if not it would show that something serious had happened to our position among the nations of the world. He had endeavoured to make a collection of the prophecies of alarm in regard to this country, and only yesterday he opened Greville's Memoirs, in which he found the following, which was written in January, 1856—

> "The only certainty is that we are blindly going on spending our wealth and our blood. Lewis says that our financial position is very bad, a declining revenue, rising prices. . . . Everything looks as black as possible."

I hon. Gentlemen opposite had their way, and if, owing to their policy not to increase our naval expenditure, we were some day involved in naval disaster and subject to an enormous war indemnity, what would be their feeling? Hon. Gentlemen would begin to wonder whether, to use a favourite phrase, they had not put their money on the wrong horse, or rather taken their money off the right horse. He thought no one had a right to come down to the House to advocate a reduction in the number of men and expenditure on the Navy, unless he could prove to demonstration that the project could be carried out without danger to the country. He thought that had not been done.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said the hon. Member for Portsmouth had assumed that hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House were in favour of cutting down the Navy. He did not himself understand on what foundation the hon. Member made that charge. He thought some of the strongest speeches in support of the Navy had been made from this side of the House. In this and previous debates there had been sufficient support given to the proposals of the Government with regard to the Navy as to render the assumption of the hon. Member opposite quite unjustifiable. Although he for one cordially supported the proposals of the Government, he thought that they themselves could not be surprised that a certain amount of restiveness should be shown with respect to the financial burdens which the country was called upon to bear. At a time when the expenditure for the defence of the Empire had gone up to £90,000,000 they might be sure that reductions would be moved, and that these reductions would not command the support of those who gave more special attention to the subject. He was afraid, too, that there would be occasions when reductions would be moved which would not tend to provide for the adequate defence of the Empire. He thought that in discussing the question of the number of men required the House laboured under two very serious disadvantages. One was that they had received no guidance from the Council of Defence as to the general policy for the defence of the Empire. Many of them were discussing this matter also under the conviction that the Army Estimates had largely tended towards making the burden more than could be borne permanently by the Empire. He hoped those responsible for the Admiralty business would take due note of the opposition which would undoubtedly arise, not so much against their proposals, but in regard to the general burdens the country was asked to bear, and also from the want of any clear policy being put before the country by what he called the sham Committee of Defence. For want of that direct guidance the people were not sufficiently educated as to what were the adequate requirements of the country for naval defence.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) said that the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had commenced by repudiating on behalf of the Party he represented any diminution of expenditure which would cut down the Navy. That was a matter which really was of very little importance; but he would point out that from that side a direct set had been made by formal motion against the number of men asked for for the Navy. Then the hon. and learned Member for Leith Burghs complained, or at all events pointed out in querulous tones, that they had had no direction from the Committee of Defence. Of course not. The Committee of Defence had been only recently created, and they had practically to review the mass of confusions of the situation, which could not be done in a few weeks or months. Moreover, he apprehended that on any matter of general policy affecting the Army and Navy, the Prime Minister, who was Chairman of the Committee of Defence, would, by the Rules of the House, be precluded from giving its directions to the Committee of the House or the reasons for it.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON said they had been told that they had been guided by the Defence Committee, which he ventured to call a sham. His contention was that, being a sham, there had been no adequate control or co-ordination of naval and military defence by that Committee.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB said that he was with the hon. Member when he called the old Committee of Defence a sham; in fact he had frequently called it in this House "a preposterous sham." He had brought proposals for a Council of Defence before the House ten or twelve years ago; and had discussed this question outside the House thirty years ago. The real point was that if the new Council of Defence was to review the whole policy and the whole necessities of the Empire, and deal with the Navy and Army as two parts of one necessary machine, and if the Prime Minister as Chairman of the Council of Defence came into the House and tried to argue the whole case he would be prevented from doing so by the Rules of Procedure. He did not see there was any cause of complaint against the Council of Defence as recently organised. Comparisons had been made between existing facts and the conditions prevailing in the Napoleonic wars, and tables and diagrams had been described; but he would entreat hon. Members to be very careful how they considered what appeared on the diagrams as applicable to the present time. His hon friend the Member for King's Lynn had rightly pointed out that the variation in the diagrams was due to the fact that in those old days there was not continuous service. He would point to the broader consideration, that all the conditions of maritime warfare had changed during the last century. Formerly the preparations for war could be hastily made and carried on while the war was actually in operation. The entire change in the conditions did affect question of men. What since then science had done was to make long preparation necessary in order to produce quick and decisive results; and therefore it followed that the training of men must be a much longer, and a more detailed and careful process than in those old days. That broad consideration showed hon. Members that they must be very cautious how they attempted to guide policy by the number of trained men required, or the provision of ships, by past experience when a wholly different state of things prevailed.

The hon. Member for King's Lynn had made a declaration with a great deal of confidence, as if it were a law of the Medes and Persians, that our food supply was safe; that it was simply impossible to prevent food coming into the country. But he would point out that the question of food supply was only an incident in the general question of the economic conditions of the country. The question was not whether wheat could come into the country, but whether the price of wheat and of all commodities affected the whole economic condition. He therefore protested against the position, resulting from our naval failure, being seriously met by an argument like that. It had been asked to what standard we were working upon? A standard, it was said, meant an abstract comparison of the number and class of ships. It meant no such thing. It was admitted that we must at least be able absolutely to hold our own against any two Maritime Powers under all circumstances. But the distribution of the ships of any two Powers, and the number of ships we had to meet them must vary. It was not a matter of the number and quality of the ships in our Fleet, and those of the other two Powers. The great matter was the force which would be required under all circumstances and conditions and all reasonable probabilities of war, to put us not merely on an equality with, but to some extent on a superiority to the forces of the other two Powers. He therefore protested now, as he had always done, against any attempt to narrow down the question to a simple and abstract comparison of the number of ships as a whole. The hon. and learned Member for Dumfries Burghs had urged that the number of men for the Fleet might be reduced by approaching the other Powers and coming to some arrangement.

*MR. SPEAKER said that the discussion of the question of general disarmament was not in order.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB said he was only going to refer to some observations on this very subject which had been made by the hon. and learned Member for Dumfries Burghs, but he would not proceed further on that point. The real truth was that the way they discussed the Estimates was somewhat embarrassing. It was generally forgotten, what had so clearly been pointed out by the late Secretary to the Admiralty, the hon. Member for Dundee, that what ruled every other Vote in the Navy Estimates was the Construction Vote. But it had never been the custom of the House to discuss the Construction Vote until those Votes for the men and wages had been sanctioned and passed. He could not conclude without expressing, as an independent Member of the House who was specially concerned in the question of naval defence, his gratitude to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Berwick Division and the Committee over which he presided for the report they had produced. Anyone who studied the question of the *personnel* of the Navy, and who drew a diagram of the variations which had occurred as regarded the *personnel*, would be astonished at the revelations he would find. That diagram would show that the Admiralty, up to the present time, had really no precise principle or policy in regulating the number and the class of men necessary for the Navy. For the first time they had now laid before them, by the efforts of the Committee presided over by the right hon. Gentleman, the definite principles which ought to guide their policy with regard to the *personnel* of the Navy; and they had the announcement, officially made by the Secretary to the Admiralty, that not only was the Admiralty indebted to this Committee for the work it had done, but was committed absolutely to the principles laid down by the Committee; and that those principles would in future guide the Admiralty with reference to the *personnel* of the Fleet.

Sir WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead) said he should like to say a few words on the Vote, as he had some direct connection with the men. He was sorry to have heard so many irrelevant subjects discussed in connection with the Vote. They had had food supply, continental Powers, the shadows of war and destruction all round, talked about, when they should have been talking about the men. The question simply was, was the Vote right. He was sorry that his hon. friend had moved the reduction, as he held that they had not a sufficient number of men at present, and he would be prepared to prove it. Great Britain with her large and increasing Navy should always be in a position when called upon at any time to use her Fleet for warlike purposes. She should be in a position, not only to man the Fleet which was afloat, but also to man the reserves. She was not in that position. A great many of the ships at present afloat were undermanned; and they could not man the reserves in case of necessity. He doubted if they could man half the Fleet properly. He thought he was within the mark when he said that the Navy was short between 8,000 and 10,000 stokers, 1,500 engine room artificers and 700 engineers. He was not dealing with the bluejackets, but with the men he knew; though it might be taken for granted that there was a shortage in the bluejackets also. What was the meaning of moving a reduction in the number of men? What was the use of building ships if they could not man them? It was simply absurd to compare the present with other days. They were now living in a steam age, and required a totally different class of man for the Navy. The men had to be very highly trained; and he had come to the conclusion that in the near future every man aboard a man-of-war would be more or less a mechanic. Therefore, the condition of things after the Napoleonic wars was not comparable with the condition of things to-day. If, for instance, they tackled the fleets of France and Spain and smashed them up, then they might reduce their *personnel*, because they would have crushed their enemies. He objected to the reduction because it was unnecessary, and because it would be detrimental to the interests of the Fleet. He held the Admiralty was now short of men, required more men, and would continue to require more men. He thought his hon. friend would be well advised to withdraw his Amendment, because, from a practical point of view, it could not stand. He would not like to see the British Fleet sent to sea undermanned and unfitted for its work. The moment they lost command of the sea then they might say "Farewell to the greatness of our country."

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, E. Toxteth) said he sympathised with his hon. and gallant friend the Member for Yarmouth in the unfortunate position in which they were placed by being obliged to discuss the Vote for the men first, and the Vote for construction later. He might carry it further, and say how awkward the position was when they were forced to discuss the Army Estimates first, and the Navy Estimates second. He did not desire to discuss the proportion between the Navy and the Army Votes; but he thought the discussion, narrow though it necessarily was, brought them back to the really fundamental issue which lay before the country, namely, what ought to be the proportion between naval and military expenditure. By an unwritten rule of the House, they were compelled to take the Navy Votes after they had committed themselves to certain expenditure on the Army. He thought that was a disadvantageous position, because the discussion to-day had brought them to realise, more than ever, the enormous importance of the Navy, the enormous importance of keeping up construction, and the even greater importance of manning the Fleet, so that it might be able to take to sea for war. He was sure they could all accept the explanation of the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty, that the men now asked for were required for ships already on order. He was sure they all welcomed the idea of adding to the *personnel* of the Fleet reserves with non-continuous service; but that should be only on condition that the *personnel* of the Fleet should have a sufficient proportion of men trained for active service. He was sure his hon. friend the Secretary to the

Admiralty appreciated as much as anyone the necessity of having a large proportion of the *personnel* of the Fleet not merely available on mobilisation, but accustomed to go to sea, so that when war broke out the Fleet would not be hampered with crews who had to be trained to their work, but would be manned by men who, from practice, were able to work enormous engines of war. He felt very strongly that the nation which, on the outbreak of war, could mobilise the largest number of ships would probably be the nation to which victory would fall. But he felt equally strongly that the victory would fall to the Navy which kept the largest number of ships in commission; and, thereby, gave their men the most ample opportunity to practise operations which would occur in actual warfare.

In considering the supply of men for the Fleet, and the increased number of ships, they were naturally led to consider how it was they found themselves as a nation in a position of having to vote such huge sums of money. He was amused and instructed by some of the speeches delivered by hon. Gentlemen opposite on the course of events which had brought this nation into a position of naval expenditure of which the Vote before the House was a sign. It was really waste of time to inquire how it was that they were committed to such extraordinary naval expenditure. It was still greater waste of time to ask which among the nations of Europe first started this country on its career of naval competition. He thought there was a more simple explanation; and it lay in the changed standpoint of all the nations of Europe, including this country, towards the value of the carrying trade, collieries, and commerce, once the unique possessions of this country, but now shared in ever increasing proportions by its rivals in both hemispheres. It was based on the increased value attached by other nations to shipping, colonies, and commerce. This was entirely the result of the monumental works of Captain Mahan, which, published first in America, had been translated into every language of Europe, into Japanese, Chinese, and other languages of the Far East, and which had exercised a most potent influence in the revolution of nineteenth century thought as to the value of oversea possessions. That revolution of thought had come to stay. Other nations had acquired fresh ideas of the value of these possessions.

*MR. SPEAKER said the hon. Member would have been in order in the Committee stage of this Vote, because he could then have discussed the general policy, but he was not in order in doing so on report.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR bowed to the ruling of Mr. Speaker and said he would not continue to discuss the general policy, a discussion into which he had rather been led by what had previously taken place. As he could not follow that line of argument he might perhaps be permitted to emphasise the importance of such a Vote as this for maintaining the efficiency of our Navy for action, and also to justify it on the ground of the unique character of the Empire which the Navy had to defend. Where the unique character of the Empire was borne in mind, that its scattered possessions were separated by thousands of miles of sea—it was imperative for the House to agree with enormous burdens of a naval character, although he agreed with many in the wish that an opportunity could have been given to discuss not merely this Vote by itself, but also the whole question of naval policy, and particularly the naval policy in relation to the military policy, which many thought ought to be its complement, and not its rival.

*MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said that, notwithstanding the amount of men who had been voted by the House during the last two years, he agreed with the hon. Member for Gateshead that they still wanted more men for the Navy, rather than with the hon. Member for Islington, who had moved the reduction, with whom he had no sympathy whatever. From the point of view of the future construction alone, of which notice had been given in the Estimates, he did not think sufficient provision had been made. For those ships alone, it would be necessary to have 9,000 additional men in preparation against the time when those ships would be launched. A most important and interesting statement had been made by the Secretary to the

Admiralty during this debate, when he referred to the system on which the Admiralty had embarked of running a short service system side by side with the old and popular long service system. We were this year entering 1,000 non-continuous ratings for the first time. That was a departure of a very novel character to this generation. The hon. Member had given some information, but the House was entitled to a little more, and he would like to know before the debate closed, if it were possible, what decision the Admiralty had come to, if any, as to what was to be the future limit in numbers of the long service ratings. The Financial Secretary had said the Admiralty had arrived at what they considered to be the necessary minimum — could the hon. Gentleman give the House any idea of what the numbers were? This year the House had voted 127,000 men, and in the previous year they voted 122,000. The hon. Gentleman or his predecessor stated a year or so since that the time was approaching when the limit would be reached for long service ratings. Now that the number of 127,000 had been reached, the Admiralty had in view the fixing of some necessary minimum, and it would be of interest to know whether the Admiralty had formed any idea of the numbers.

Secondly, he would like to know from the right hon. Gentleman whether the Admiralty had arrived at any standard which was to govern the short service, so as to work the short service and the long service together. Although 1,000 non-continuous ratings had been entered in the Estimates, the House did not know what proportion they were to bear to the long service ratings. The Report of the Manning Commission had suggested that with regard to the stokers the proportion should be one-sixth, and with regard to the seamen it should be one-fourth. The Report also attached the greatest importance to establishing a reserve of stokers. There was no doubt that in the Navy at the present time there was a great dearth of stokers, and the Manning Committee pointed out that that was one of the ratings it would be necessary to build up in considerable strength. The difficulty in getting a sufficient number of stokers, as he had pointed out over and over again, was the bad inducements offered to those who came into the Navy. The stoker class has the hardest worked and the worst paid rating in the Fleet. The Admiralty were now going to give a new rating to a class they termed mechanicians, but if they paid an inferior price for the raw material, they were not likely to attract the best men. It was under these circumstances he thought the moment was opportune for asking the question he had put to the hon. Gentleman.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) said the decision of Mr. Speaker had made it impossible to discuss the general question with regard to the Navy Estimates, and particularly as regarded the Army Estimates, for which he thought it was desirable they should find an appropriate occasion. He rose, therefore, merely for the purpose of saying that he disassociated himself altogether from the suggestions that had been made, that we could safely reduce the number of men employed in the Navy. He was satisfied, not only that the number at present proposed was not more than was automatically necessary, in order to man and equip the ships for the building and maintaining of which the House had committed itself, but that we must most carefully guard against any premature unnecessary reduction of that which was, after all, the one source of the ultimate strength of the country. He did not in the least prejudge the questions which might arise when they arrived at the shipbuilding Vote, but he wished, so far as he was concerned, to say in the most explicit terms that he saw no reason whatever to reduce the number of our fleet by a single man.

Resolution agreed to.

Ordered, That the Resolution which, upon the 18th day of this instant March, was reported from the Committee of Supply, and which was then agreed to by the House, be now read.

"That a number of Land Forces, not exceeding 235,761, all ranks, be maintained for the Service of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland at Home and Abroad, excluding his

Majesty's Indian Possessions, during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

Ordered, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to provide, during twelve months, for the Discipline and Regulation of the Army; and that Mr. Secretary Brodrick, Mr. Arnold-Forster, and Lord Stanley do prepare and bring it in.

ARMY (ANNUAL) BILL.

"To provide, during twelve months, for the Discipline and Regulation of the Army," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 114.]

SUPPLY [17th March].

Order read, for further consideration of second Resolution.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

"That a sum, not exceeding £6,312,800, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the expenses of wages, etc., to officers, seamen and boys, Coast Guard and Royal Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1904."

Mr. KEARLEY thought he was now entitled to ask for a reply to the question he had asked.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he could not answer the question before. The hon. Member had asked whether the Admiralty had decided what proportion of non-continuous service men were to go into the ships. The answer was that it was impossible for the present Admiralty to decide a question of that kind. It would be years before there were sufficient numbers to provide for the proportion of stokers and bluejackets recommended by the Committee. It would be impossible for anybody to pledge themselves as to the limit to be arrived at from the discontinuance of the long service.

Resolution agreed to.

SUPPLY [18th March]—REPORT.

Resolutions reported.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £784,300, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the expense of half-pay, reserved, and retired pay, to officers of the Navy and Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £350,100, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the expense of civil pensions and gratuities, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904.

Resolutions agreed to.

SUPPLY [19th March]—REPORT.

Resolution reported.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1903–4 (Vote on Account).

"That a sum, not exceeding £20,265,000, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for or towards defraying the charges for the following Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904, viz.:—

Civil Services.

Class II.

	£
Colonial Office - - - -	25,000

Class IV.

Board of Education -	6,000,000

Class II.

Board of Agriculture	65,000

Class III.

Crofters Commission, Scotland	2,000

Class I.

Royal Palaces and Marlborough House - -	40,000
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens - - -	50,000
Houses of Parliament Buildings - - -	16,000
Miscellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain - - -	30,000
Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain - - -	20,000
Diplomatic and Consular Buildings - - -	18,000

	£
Revenue Buildings - - -	225,000
Public Buildings, Great Britain -	225,000
Surveys of the United Kingdom	90,000
Harbours under the Board of Trade - - -	7,000
Peterhead Harbour - - -	6,000
Rates on Government Property -	250,000
Public Works and Buildings, Ireland - - -	110,000
Railways, Ireland - - -	80,000

CLASS II.

United Kingdom and England :—

House of Lords Offices - -	2,000
House of Commons Offices - -	12,000
Treasury and Subordinate Departments - - -	40,000
Home Office - - - -	60,000
Foreign Office - - - -	30,000
Privy Council Office, &c. - -	5,000
Board of Trade - - -	75,000
Mercantile Marine Services -	30,000
Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade - - -	3
Charity Commission - - -	15,000
Civil Service Commission - -	18,000
Exchequer and Audit Department - - - - -	25,000
Friendly Societies Registry -	3,000
Local Government Board - -	85,000
Lunacy Commission - - -	5,000
Mint (including Coinage) - -	5
National Debt Office - - -	6,000
Public Record Office - - -	10,000
Public Works Loan Commission	5
Registrar-General's Office - -	19,000
Stationery and Printing - -	320,000
Woods, Forests, &c., Office of -	8,000
Works and Public Buildings, Office of - - - -	30,000
Secret Service - - - -	40,000

Scotland :—

Secretary for Scotland - -	25,000
Fishery Board - - - -	8,000
Lunacy Commission - - -	3,000
Registrar-General's Office - -	5,000
Local Government Board - -	6,000

Ireland :—

Lord Lieutenant's Household -	2,000
Chief Secretary for Ireland -	16,000
Department of Agriculture -	75,000
Charitable Donations and Bequests Office - - -	1,000
Local Government Board - -	25,000
Public Record Office - - -	2,000
Public Works Office - - -	18,000
Registrar General's Office - -	6,000
Valuation and Boundary Survey	7,000

CLASS III.

United Kingdom and England :—

Law Charges - - - - -	35,000
Miscellaneous Legal Expenses -	27,000
Supreme Court of Judicature -	140,000
Land Registry - - - -	20,000
County Courts - - - -	8,000
Police, England and Wales -	18,000
Prisons, England and the Colonies - - - - -	340,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain -	140,000
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum - - - -	14,000

Scotland :—

Law Charges and Courts of Law	30,000
Register House, Edinburgh -	15,000
Prisons, Scotland - - -	40,000

Ireland :—

Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions - - - -	35,000
Supreme Court of Judicature, and other Legal Departments - - - -	45,000
Land Commission - - -	55,000
County Court Officers, &c. -	46,000
Dublin Metropolitan Police -	45,000
Royal Irish Constabulary - -	600,000
Prisons, Ireland - - -	50,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools - - - -	55,000
Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum - - - -	3,000

CLASS IV.

United Kingdom and England :—

British Museum - - -	80,000
National Gallery - - -	10,000
National Portrait Gallery - -	3,000
Wallace Collection - - -	4,000
Scientific Investigation, &c., United Kingdom - -	22,000
Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales - -	42,000

Scotland :—

Public Education - - -	750,000
National Gallery - - -	3,000

Ireland:—

	£
Public Education	730,000
Endowed Schools Commissioners	400
National Gallery	3,000
Queen's Colleges	2,500

CLASS V.

Diplomatic and Consular Services	250,000
Uganda, Central and East Africa Protectorates, and Uganda Railway	320,000
Colonial Services	300,000
Cyprus, Grant in Aid	85,000
Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable	32,000

CLASS VI.

Superannuation and Retired Allowances	280,000
Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, etc.	2,000
Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances	1,000
Hospitals and Charities, Ireland	17,000
Savings Bank and Friendly Societies Deficiencies	— —

CLASS VII.

Temporary Commissions	25,000
Miscellaneous Expenses	16,087
Repayments to the Local Loans Fund	— —
St. Louis Exhibition, 1904	— —
Total for Civil Services	£13,035,000

Revenue Departments:—

Customs	350,000
Inland Revenue	830,000
Post Office	3,800,000
Post Office Packet Service	250,000
Post Office Telegraphs	2,000,000
Total for Revenue Departments	£7,230,000
Grand Total	£20,265,000

Resolution read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said he understood that this Vote was not to be taken until the evening sitting, and many Members had probably left the House under that impression.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD (Somersetshire, Wellington) said he had no desire to use the House unfairly. The opportunity for discussion at the evening sitting would probably be somewhat curtailed by private business, and he thought it would be for the convenience of the House to devote the remaining hour and a half of the present sitting to the Report of the Resolution.

*MR. SPEAKER: I might point out that a question of some difficulty arises on the Standing Order. The Standing Order says:

> "Of the days so allotted, not more than one day in Committee should be allotted to any Vote on Account, and not more than one sitting to the Report of that Vote. At midnight at the close of the day on which the Committee of the Vote is taken, or at the close of the sitting at which the Report of the Vote is taken, the Chairman of the Committee or the Speaker, as the case may be, should put every question to dispose of the Vote or Report."

The question arises whether, if the Vote is taken now, I should be compelled at half-past seven to put the question, or whether the discussion could be continued at the evening sitting. It seems to me that the intention of the Standing Order is that there should be a sitting allotted to the Report, and that the sitting allotted to the present Report is the evening sitting. Therefore, the "allotted sitting" being the evening sitting, I should not be entitled to apply the automatic closure to the Vote at half-past seven, if it is taken now. Accordingly, though the construction of the rule is very doubtful, I should be prepared to rule that the debate might go on now, if the House chooses to take it, until half-past seven, and that it would be in order to resume it at the evening sitting, and apply the automatic closure, if necessary, at twelve o'clock.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) thought the House would be much relieved at the interpretation of the Order just given, because, if the Standing Order had been otherwise interpreted, it would have been possible for the discussion to commence at seven o'clock, and then at half past seven to be automatically closured. Many Members were under the impression that the Vote on Account would not be taken until the evening sitting, but, on the understanding that the discussion could be then resumed, he did not see any objection to proceeding with the Vote until half past seven.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) commented on the small amount proposed to be spent in connection with the St. Louis Exposition. France, Germany, and all the other principal countries had set aside amounts much larger than the £30,000 here proposed, and it was not at all creditable to the Government that they should have suggested a sum totally insufficient to be of any real service in the encouragement and the provision of British representation at the Exposition. If ever there was a time when Britain ought to do everything it possibly could to encourage friendly relations with America, it was now. Although late in the day, the Government would be well-advised to revise its Estimate.

*MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said that last year it was arranged that the Board of Agriculture should consult with the War Office and, if possible, devise some means by which to enable the War Office to purchase horses for remounts direct from the farmers. Recently the Secretary of State had said a circular was about to be sent to the various County Councils on the matter. He desired to ask whether the President of the Board of Agriculture knew about that circular, and whether it was sent out with his approbation. It was most important that farmers in the horse-breeding districts should know exactly the stamp of horse required. He regretted that the President of the Board of Agriculture had stated he had very little money at his disposal, but the idea could be greatly assisted at a very small expense by classes being instituted in the various local shows for horses suitable for the Army, every exhibit in such classes being entered for sale at a certain price. Another question was that of railway rates. The right hon. Gentleman had admitted that the farmers had a grievance in this matter, but what steps was he going to take to remedy it? Was he going to proceed by legislation or by administration? If he intended to proceed by means of administration, it would be well to commence at once, so that the effect of his operations would be known by the end of the year, in time for legislation to be prepared for next session if necessary. He also desired to know the number of prosecutions and convictions which had taken place under the Order prohibiting the sale of butter containing more than 16 per cent. of water.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) said there was a strong feeling in the country that some of the regulations with regard to swine fever were working very hardly. In some cases where swine fever seemed to have been stamped out it had suddenly re-appeared. If the right hon. Gentleman could hold out any hope of swine fever being put an end to very shortly, farmers might be willing to put up with the inconvenience of the regulations, but at present they felt that they pressed with undue hardship and were not really necessary. As to the question of railway rates, the right hon. Gentleman had recently stated that if the companies did not come into line he had a rod in pickle for them. No action, however, had as yet been taken, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would soon exercise whatever powers he had. The "owner's risk" rates required looking into. Railway companies were inclined to give cheap rates at owner's risk, but they took away with one hand what they gave with the other. In the milk traffic the companies practically took no charge and acknowledged no responsibility. If milk got spoilt in transit or churns were lost, farmers were not able to obtain compensation, the plea of the companies being that it was sent at owner's risk. It was no answer to say that it could be sent at the risk of the company, because in that case the rates were doubled, which rendered it absolutely prohibitive. If the right hon. Gentleman intimated to the companies that if they persisted in their course of action he would have to interfere, or obtain power to interfere, it would probably do some good.

Then the right hon. Gentleman had stated that he intended to set up in different parts of the country fifteen or twenty advisory boards, with the object of getting special information of special wants in particular districts. There was a good deal to be said for the idea if the wish of the right hon. Gentleman was to get to know what was going on in the districts, especially as regarded the small men who, perhaps, were not able to make their voices heard in the large Chambers of Agriculture. But would not that object be equally well attained by the appointment of correspondents in different districts, such as the Board of Trade had appointed for its purposes? The idea of setting up official or semi official boards was entirely against the general practice of the country. Hitherto it had been our boast that we had not agricultural boards or establishments under State aid or control, such as existed in continental countries, and great bodies like the Royal Society, the Bath and West of England Society, and some of the small bodies had been absolutely untrammelled by red tape, and able freely to express their opinions to the Minister of the day. In connection with advisory boards there was bound to be a certain political element, as a number of the members would be nominated by the President of the Board of Agriculture for the time being, to whom those members would necessarily look for the continuance of their appointment. That was hardly a desirable state of things. Special information on small points could be better obtained either through correspondents, or by means of the farmers' clubs which were scattered throughout the country. The more he thought of it the more he felt that the establishment of such boards would be a dangerous step. He had every confidence that as long as the right hon. Gentleman held his present office such boards would be kept within proper limits, but future occupants of the office might so use the boards as to disregard the opinion of the House of Commons, on the ground that they had their own advisory boards by whom they would be guided.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham) supported the suggestion of the hon. Member for the Kirkcaldy Burghs that the grant in connection with the St. Louis Exposition should be considerably increased. Much had been heard recently about economy, but this was not a matter in which it should be unnecessarily practised. Our national credit and prestige were largely concerned in this question, and during his last visit to the United States he found, both in the highest quarters and among the "men in the street," a very keen desire that this country should be adequately represented at the Exposition. A very bad effect would be produced in the United States if the English grant was one of the smallest made by any of the civilised Powers. It would be hardly creditable to the Government to suggest a contribution one-fifth of that of Germany, and less than one-half of that of China. He hoped before all the space was taken the grant would be increased, at any rate to the amount appropriated by Germany.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) asked for information as to the advisory boards, which were quite new institutions. He understood that these boards were to have a majority elected by the farmers, and a minority to be nominated by the President of the Board of Agriculture. He would like to know what proportion the minority would bear to the majority; whether any of these members were to be paid, and if so, at what and whose expense; whether there would be a special Vote for them and under what Estimate they would come. So far as he understood the present methods of obtaining information, a man like the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the department had little difficulty in obtaining it, because he had gone into the matter thoroughly, and could get his information at the local farmers' clubs. If in the future they had not an equally energetic and careful President of the Board he did not see how the required information would be obtained, by means of which the President could nominate the proper men on these advisory boards.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston) said that with regard to the Sparks from Locomotives Bill and the question of forestry, which the Government had been recommended to take up, he was considering how far it was possible to carry out the recommendations of the Committee on the subject, but he could not yet give a definite answer. With regard to the question of the advisory committees he had proposed, he thought there was rather an exaggerated importance attached to those bodies, as though they were to control in any way the Board of Agriculture, and the Board must necessarily be governed by their advice. He was afraid that that was the last sort of council he should think of appointing. He was struck by the fact that at the present moment the Central Chamber of Agriculture dealt rather with general agricultural questions than in trying to obtain definite information regarding local questions. No Society or Central Chamber met so constantly as to be within touch of the agriculturist, so that he could at a moment's notice get the information he wanted. Then, again, the societies had acquired the bad habit, instead of discussing local requirements, of taking up kind of snowball resolutions from one another, which they debated and which had no effect whatever upon him. That being so, it occurred to him it was necessary to be, from day to day, in touch with those who represented, and could speak for, the local requirements of a particular district. There was no industry which varied so much from county to county, and almost from district to district, as agriculture. Then with regard to the politics of agriculture he thought the less they brought politics into the question the better it was. He hoped the advisory boards would keep politics at arm's length and would only be business bodies to deal with actual hard facts and farming life in their particular district. He agreed with the hon. Member for Somersetshire that a better name would be correspondents, and although he was by no means anxious they should meet very often, he wanted to get representative men in all districts of England with whom he could be in actual touch. He did not want there to be any idea that these gentlemen would control him in any way. It was proposed to divide Great Britain into twenty divisions and appoint fifteen or sixteen gentlemen to each division. It was no matter how they were to be appointed so long as they really voiced the views of their district. Out of the fifteen or sixteen the great bulk should be elected by the Agricultural Societies of their districts. He only retained the power to nominate a certain number because he felt that too often in those societies there was not a sufficient representation of the smaller men who, after all, represented the great proportion of the farmers of England. He wanted to be brought into touch with them just as much as with the larger farmers. As to payment, he knew it was rather difficult to extract money from the Treasury, and he thought that except for the expense of travelling they ought not to call on the Treasury to provide the money. He was quite sure he could appeal to those gentlemen to have sufficient interest in their own industry to assist him in the way described.

The question of railway rates was a difficult matter for him to handle, because railway companies were not in his department. He should like to say that, before coming to Parliament, there were two things to be done before he pressed his colleagues to make any alteration in the present law. He must collect facts. General grumbling was of no use whatever; he must have facts, and plenty of them. In Scotland and Yorkshire he had been assisted by the County Councils. In Scotland especially a vast amount of information with regard to rates had been laid before him and had been of great service. The information he had already collected had shown him that a great number of complaints arose from misunderstanding of both the actual facts of the case and the law. It had convinced him that when all had been said or done, the railway companies might be fairly approached and would deal with the matter. In Scotland that had already been done, and to a large extent the railway companies had met the case fairly; alterations in the rates had taken place and the farmers had been relieved. It all depended upon accurate information, and he was sure his hon. friend, as a Member of the House and Chairman of the Central Chamber, would do good service if he would take steps to assist him in getting more information, which would justify him in approaching the railway companies with sufficient evidence. He proposed to approach the railway companies first in a friendly manner, because it was not to the interests of the railway companies to neglect this important branch of trade. It was a fact that great pressure was put upon the railway companies to encourage the importation of produce from abroad, because in the first place they were sometimes owners of steamers. It was a remarkable fact that whilst this House laid upon the railway companies, so far as land rates were concerned, certain limitations which required them to show equal justice all round, there was no such limitation with regard to steam ships, and it was possible for a railway company owning a line of steamers running from Copenhagen to Hull, and carrying goods from Hull to Birmingham, to charge exactly the same amount from Hull to Birmingham as from Copenhagen to Birmingham, *via* Hull. As a rule the farmer was confined to a particular railway, whereas the foreigner was in a position to choose his railway, and consequently got the benefit of competitive rates. He hoped that when the facts were brought sufficiently before the railway companies they would see that it was to their own interest to cultivate the home trade more than they had done in the past. The difficulty was that the railway companies varied so much in their charges. The Great Eastern Railway Company dealt generously with parcels up to 7 lbs., but other companies did not, although they treated larger parcels favourably. Surely they might find some system which would bring them into line.

With regard to swine fever, it could not be stamped out without drastic regulations; but his desire was to make his regulations work with as little friction as possible, and he was always open to listen to advice from local authorities, or even from individual farmers, if he could do so reasonably. There was, no doubt, much grumbling with regard to the regulations of local authorities which were not under his control; but he hardly knew a single case in which a farmer had any real reason to complain of their action. He knew it was said that the areas were too large and that the boundaries were not prescribed as scientifically as they might be. It was thought necessary to have the boundaries of the petty sessional divisions because the police were acquainted with them. He was quite willing, however, if he could find other boundaries well-known to the police and the public, to alter his regulations in that respect.

As to the question of remounts, that matter, after all, rested entirely with the War Office, and he had no control over it. His duty solely consisted in conveying to farmers what the War Office required with regard to the purchase of remounts. As the hon. Member was aware he had been pressing the War Office to deal directly with the farmers, as far as possible, and give them all the information possible. He was sorry to say that the requirements of the War Office in this respect were not very large, and he did not think the question was of great interest to farmers. It would be if the War Office bought on a large scale; but when they required only 2,500 horses a year, and only 1,600 from Great Britain, it did not seem a matter of very great interest to the farmers either of Great Britain or Ireland. No doubt, however, farmers ought to have the fullest information. He understood that the War Office would in about a fortnight send their regulations to the Board of Agriculture, and they would be sent to the farmers. As to prosecutions under the butter regulations, they were in charge of the local authorities, and, so far as the Board could collect information, he believed there had been some thirty-five prosecutions since the order was issued last May. Of course he might obtain full information by applying to the local authorities, but he hardly thought it would be worth while to do that. He thought he had now answered all the questions put to him.

*SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) said they were all interested in the remarks made by the right hon. Gentleman, especially in regard to the work he had been doing connected with the advisory boards. They all knew how the right hon. Gentleman had thrown himself into the practical work of his Department. But while he said that, he was afraid that the right hon. Gentleman might have taken a dangerous course in creating these advisory boards over the length and breadth of England and Wales. It conveyed too much the idea of powerful organised bodies in particular localities. He thought the advantage to be obtained from the districts could be obtained by responsible correspondents. The difficulty about advisory boards was that they to some extent diminished the responsibility of headquarters and were apt to take upon themselves functions which did not properly belong to them. The right hon. Gentleman would get the information he wanted more thoroughly by the appointment of one or more correspondents in each centre than by such boards as he suggested. They were all agreed that the information was very important, in a comparatively new department like the Board of Agriculture, in order that the right hon. Gentleman might try to bring about remedies for the grievances in the different parts of the country.

With reference to the question of railway rates the right hon. Gentleman said the Board laboured under the disadvantage of a deficiency of exact information. He himself knew that. Some years ago there was some difficulty in getting to know exactly the grievances in particular localities. It seemed to him that accurate information could be better obtained and tabulated by a responsible correspondent than by any committee of gentlemen forming an advisory board. He was very anxious that railway rates should be equalised all over the country in the interest, especially, of small holders, of whom there was an increasing number. He hoped that as years went on there would be a still greater number of people holding small plots and producing perishable food produce. It was of the greatest importance that such produce should be conveyed on the easiest possible terms by the railway companies. Light railways had not given the advantages which were expected from them in connection with the conveyance of produce of this kind. He was sure that any pressure the Board of Agriculture could bring to bear on the great railway companies to try to equalise their rates, in order to give impartial terms to producers in various parts of the country, would be of great benefit. The right hon. Gentleman made a remark which suggested to his mind a possible danger of interference on the part of the Board of Agriculture. He said that produce might be conveyed from Copenhagen to Birmingham *viâ* Hull almost as cheaply as produce could be sent from Yorkshire to the same Midland city. He believed there were many examples of that kind. He thought it pressed hardly on the producer of articles within our own shores that farmers in Denmark should be able to send produce to markets in this country for about the same cost. While endeavouring to remedy an injustice the right hon. Gentleman must not remedy it at the expense of the consumer, because, after all, this country depended very much on the cheapness of the food of the people in order that we might maintain our supremacy in manufacturing industries. The right hon. Gentleman must be careful not to take any step to make the food of the poorest portion of the community dearer by kindly interference on behalf of another class of citizens.

With regard to the St. Louis Exhibition, he hoped that something a little more liberal might be done than hitherto in connection with that project. This country ought to be represented in a way worthy of our traditions and of our industrial and commercial position. Germany was able to give five times the amount we had granted in order that that country might be well represented at that Exhibition. He thought it was time that we were a little more alive in this matter. He believed that the money would be well spent, and that it would be brought back to this country over and over again in the shape of orders for our productions.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HAYES FISHER, Fulham) said that hon. Gentlemen who had spoken had expressed the hope that the £30,000 which stood on the Estimates for the St. Louis Exhibition, did not represent the final decision of the Government, and they sounded a warning note that it would be regarded as entirely inadequate. Speaking on behalf of the Government, and entirely sharing the views expressed by hon. Gentlemen, he could assure them that this sum of £30,000 appearing on the Estimates was not a final but a preliminary sum. It was calculated that they could only, in all probability, spend that sum this year, but the final amount had not yet been fixed. He agreed with the views expressed that it was most essential we should do everything to maintain our friendly relations with the United States above all other countries, and it was his opinion that exhibitions of this kind were one of the most valuable means of establishing such friendly relations. He knew that the American nation attached very great importance to this coming exhibition. He understood it would be conducted on a magnificent scale, and he believed it would have far-reaching results. What was exactly the amount of money that would be demanded in connection with the representation of Great Britain at the exhibition was now under consideration, and he thought that the opinion expressed that day by the House of Commons would have some influence with his right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was necessary that the Government should know what amount of money Germany and other foreign countries intended to spend on the exhibition, and inquiries to that effect had been made during the winter, so that they had now some means of gauging what our contribution should be. Above all, what the Government wanted to know was, how far their expenditure was going to be backed up by private manufacturers and collectors in this country; he hoped this short debate might be the means of bringing this St. Louis Exhibition to the notice of the great leaders of commerce and industry in this country, and that they would unite in putting forward their best efforts to worthily maintain the position and industrial prestige of Great Britain in the exhibition.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said he wished to call attention to a matter in the Colonial Office Report in regard to native labour in South Africa. On Thursday of last week he asked from the Colonial Secretary an assurance that the old law under which gold-mining claims in the Transvaal were allocated would not be abrogated,† and the right hon. Gentleman said that no such law had ever been in existence, and then went on to describe the methods by which these claims were allocated. A great deal of disorder, the right hon. Gentleman said, had arisen in connection with these claims, and there had been some suggestions or proposals for a lottery law, but the right hon. Gentleman indicated that they had come to nothing. Since then he had had an opportunity of discussing the documents bearing upon the matter, and that was his excuse for again troubling the House by referring to it. The earlier custom in the Transvaal, as on all other goldfields, was that when a farm or a bit of land was proclaimed a goldfield it was open to all and sundry to peg out claims, Consequently, if the field turned out rich, there was a great deal of disorder, and sometimes lives were lost, in the scramble which took place for claims. In 1895 such a scene took place in the allocation of the claims on a farm in the Transvaal, and serious apprehensions were raised in the minds of the people as to what the consequences might be if the old method of allocation were adhered to. Two farms, supposed to be especially valuable, were declared to be goldfields, and a new method was introduced by which claimants had to present themselves at the Field Cornet's office to obtain a licence, on which they could proceed to the goldfields and peg out a claim. In this particular case the applicants for licences numbered many thousands, and it was known that some of the big gold companies hired prize-fighters to stand outside the Field Cornet's Office to prevent smaller and weaker men from getting into the office and obtaining a licence. These companies also hired blood horses to carry the licences from the Field Cornet's Office to the goldfields; and some of their rivals, it was said, employed other desperadoes to shoot the horses and obtain possession of the licences.

As a result of this state of affairs the Executive Council of the Transvaal Republic passed an Emergency Law which legalised the lottery system in allocating claims. An American named

---

† See page 1252.

Brown disputed the validity of the new law, and raised an action against the Government before Judge Kotze, in which he was successful, whereupon the Transvaal Government dismissed the Judge, and that became one of the justifications for the war. The lottery method was continued from 1895 down to the outbreak of the war. He had a copy of the *Standard and Diggers' News* for April 6th, 1899. That paper contained one and a half columns describing the terms on which claims were to be allocated. It was an official document; was signed by Mr. Reitz, the State Secretary; and was dated Pretoria, April 4th, 1899. Under the form of lottery mentioned in that document every citizen over the age of sixteen, and every outlander who had paid his poll tax, was entitled to apply for a ticket and to share in the lottery. As a matter of fact, some 30,000 burghers and outlanders did apply, and received lottery tickets towards the close of the year 1899, in connection with the allocation of claims on the particular farms mentioned. The outbreak of the war stopped the ballot taking place, and it was still in suspense.

The point he desired to make was that unless those claims were to be allocated by lottery, as under the old Transvaal law, the working people in the Transvaal would stand no chance whatever of competing for claims put up to auction to the highest bidder. Under the old law, everyone, rich and poor, had an equal opportunity of becoming the possessor of a claim. He was advised that on the two farms to which he was referring, gold deposits of enormous value had been found; and that many of the claims might be worth anything up to £500,000 or £600,000. The people who had applied for tickets were entitled to their chance of obtaining one of those claims, and would feel it very hard indeed if one of the results of the war was that they would be debarred from the right which they possessed under the old Transvaal Government. He asked from the right hon. Gentleman some assurance that the allocation of claims in the Transvaal should be conducted on the lines of a lottery, as otherwise the monopolists would be able to extend their sphere of influence over every yard of ground worth purchasing, and the small financier would have no chance of competing with them. He hoped that one charge more would not have to be brought against those responsible for public affairs since the war—namely, that they were playing into the hands of the rich, and were barring others from opportunities they possessed before the war. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would see to it that the new gold laws should be so framed as not to put a monopoly of the paying parts of the country into the hands of the present mine-owners; but that every citizen of the Transvaal should have at least an equal opportunity of trying his luck.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): Though I do not think the hon. Member's facts are quite accurate, I do not dispute them. I was certainly under the impression that, although the late Transvaal Government had passed legislation to enable a system of allotment of claims by lottery to be carried out, that legislation had not in practice been applied in any single case. But I may be wrong, as the hon. Member speaks of one case in which the lottery system was adopted. He may be more accurate with regard to that matter than is my memory. At any rate, it was adopted in very few cases. The system which is to take the place of the old system is not yet settled. It is clear that, in the first instance, it concerns the people of the Transvaal. As I explained to the hon. Member when the Vote was under discussion before, it is intended to propose the system in the new gold law, which will be brought before and discussed by the Legislative Council in public, and probably passed as amended by the council. But the people of the Transvaal will have a full opportunity of criticising any proposal which may be made. I should not like to express any final conclusion on the subject; but I may tell the hon. Member that his idea that it is a question between the monopolists and the working classes is certainly an entire mistake. Whatever system you have—lottery, pegging-out, or sale by auction—the working of these claims must fall into the hands of the large capitalists. A gold mine in the Transvaal requires something like half a million, or a million, of money to establish and start the necessary machinery; and therefore it is not comparable to alluvial gold-mining, where the first workman who comes can wash his gold and take his profit. The only thing which the pegger-out got under the old system, or which a lottery-holder got under the new system, was a claim which he could offer to the capitalist; and if, as the hon. Member suggests, the capitalist was a monopolist, the capitalist would be able to fix his own price, and so get the claim at a low value. No doubt, if things of this kind are going, we should all desire that as many people as possible should have an opportunity of making a profit out of them; but they cannot make much profit, because ultimately the claim must come into the hands of the capitalist.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: One claim was drawn by a miner and sold for £101,000.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I should doubt that. But, assuming that that is true, it does not strengthen the argument in favour of any of the existing systems. Will anyone tell me why that miner by a mere chance should have obtained £101,000? What had he done to deserve it? He had not worked for it, or spent money on it, or shown any intelligence. He had simply bought a lottery ticket for a few pounds or pence, it had turned up trumps, and he had made £101,000. That is a gigantic gamble; and I do not think that it is in the interests of the working classes, or of any other class, to encourage gambling of that kind. What is desirable is to see that in future the community at large, and not the individual miner, should have a larger share of the advantages of the wealth that is hidden under the surface. Under the old system the State did not get enough. The profits went to private people, and the community did not receive a sufficient proportion. One of the objects of the new law will be to secure, if possible, a larger proportion for the State, of the value of the gold. If that can be accomplished it will be to the advantage of not the individual, but the community as a whole, and that I take it is the object which the hon. Gentleman has in view. But I ask the House to postpone any judgment on the subject until it has been discussed by those best qualified to give an opinion, and until legislation has been under the consideration of the Legislative Council.

MR. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness) called attention to the condition of lawlessness in the Highlands and islands of Scotland, and said that in South Uist there should be no difficulty in making the land suitable for the crofters to settle upon. He had urged the Secretary for Scotland to take action, and the Congested Districts Board had been petitioned for years, but nothing had been done. The Secretary for Scotland had told them that no inquiry could be made. That decision, he thought, would not conduce to the peace and good government of the district, and he would ask the Secretary for Scotland to reconsider his decision and make some inquiry into the condition of these poor unfortunate people. If the same condition of things existed in England, it would not be tolerated for a moment—public attention would be drawn to the matter, and the grievance would be redressed. They had there 115 excellent citizens anxious to settle on the land, and yet could not do so. Under similar circumstances in England, public opinion would insist upon their demands being attended to.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I really must protest against part of the language used by my hon. friend when he speaks of the petitions of the cottars in this neighbourhood having been ignored, and it is especially hard when that accusation is made against the proprietrix in South Uist, because I venture to say that however much you may disagree with Lady Gordon Cathcart's views upon how far it is advisable to set up still more cottages and small holdings, no one who knows the history of her life for many years past but must acknowledge that she has really tried from her heart to do her best for the people of that neighbourhood, and it has caused her much heart feeling, trouble, and anxiety.

MR. DEWAR said he fully acknowledged that.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: I am very glad to have that admission. On the other hand, I am very far from meaning that the condition of the people in this part of the world is what one would like it to be. But it is the old, old story of the multiplication of a population on ground that will not properly support them, and the misfortune always has been, and always will be, that the more kind-hearted the proprietor is in not putting in force with draconian severity the estate regulations against squatting, the more the grievance is felt. I can assure the hon. Member there is no wish on the part of my noble friend the Secretary for Scotland not to make every inquiry to see whether the position of these particular cottars can be helped by the Congested Districts Board; but as my hon. friend knows well, the Secretary for Scotland was in the very condition of making preparation for enquiry when the news came that these cottars had taken forcible possession, not of ground that was going to waste, but of ground in the occupation of another farmer. They had begun to assert their rights by putting seaweed on ground which was admittedly not in their holding. Everyone knows that putting seaweed on the ground is an intimation to all concerned that they are going to dig up the ground My noble friend stated that he would not allow the inquiry to go on so long as there was this overt action on their part to take the law into their own hands. I am exceedingly glad to hear from the hon. Member to-night that some of them have receded from that attitude, but the receding from that attitude—certainly the last time I spoke to my hon. friend, which was only this morning—had not then been communicated to him. That is a change of circumstances I am very glad to know, and I can assure the hon. Gentleman that if the attitude is changed, and it is made perfectly clear that they are not going to take the law into their own hands, he will find there is not the slightest disinclination on the part of the Secretary for Scotland to inquire into the matter, and to do all in his power to meet, as far as possible, the wants of these people.

*MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said the argument of the Lord Advocate with regard to these unfortunate people would lead the House to believe that the fault was entirely with the landlord in not behaving with sufficient draconic severity. The real trouble was that they could not get an acre of land to cultivate, and thus obtain food for their families. A large quantity of this island was taken up by one or two sheep farmers, and it was exactly the same in his own constituency. The poor unfortunate crofters and cottars were driven to the worst parts of the island. For his own part, he did not see the necessity for any inquiry, because the facts were already before the House and Government. The people were more or less in a state of starvation, and what was needed was a law giving the power of taking land compulsorily for the benefit of the people. The House would admit that landlords' rights could only be exercised to a certain extent. In this case the bailiff put down his foot, and said: "The land is mine, and I will not sell it." Whilst that action was allowed in Scotland, in the case of Ireland the Government came down with a scheme providing millions and millions of money. The right hon. Gentleman ought to induce the Government to pass a short Act giving the power to purchase this land on satisfactory terms for the people who wanted it to live upon, and also to the owner. He thought they might have had a little more sympathetic answer from the right hon. Gentleman. It was quite time that a check was put upon the system under which one or two wealthy people, because they were rich and did not care what became of the people, let the land to one large farmer instead of giving the poor cottars the right to the land to which they were entitled. The sympathy of the whole House ought to go out to these poor people, and everything possible ought to be done to relieve them. The right hon. Gentleman ought to send some one to inquire into the whole circumstances, or he might spend his Easter recess in the neighbourhood.

And, it being half-past Seven of the Clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (TRAMWAYS AND IMPROVEMENTS) BILL [BY ORDER].

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) said he did not at this moment propose to move the rejection of this Bill, for reasons he would state. He objected principally to the Bill because it provided among other things for making a tramway along the Embankment from Waterloo Bridge to Westminster Bridge, and over Westminster Bridge. But inasmuch as there were other parts of the Bill which had the approval of the local authorities where these tramways lay, he did not see his way to object to the whole Bill, and he did not therefore desire to move the Motion standing in his name, but would content himself with moving an instruction which stood upon the Paper when the Bill had received its Second Reading.

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE (Camberwell, Dulwich) said he much objected to trams going over Westminster Bridge. There was a very good service of busses, and this projected line was not necessary. For reasons similar to those given by the Member who had just spoken, he did not propose to move the rejection of the Bill. He also would wait till a later stage.

The Bill was read a second time, and committed.

MIDLAND AND BELFAST AND NORTHERN COUNTIES RAILWAYS BILL [BY ORDER].

[SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.) in moving the rejection of this Bill said Ireland was already in possession of 300 railway directors, or one director for every ten miles of railway, and as a result she had the worst managed railways in the world. The promoters of this Bill now proposed that as the local directors had made such a hash of affairs, they should import from England a number of intelligent foreigners, who knew nothing of the country or the people, in order to make matters if possible worse. The objections to the Bill were numerous, and he thought sufficiently strong to justify the House in rejecting it altogether. In the first place, its passage would very seriously impede any efforts which might be made to deal thoroughly with the scandal of railway mismanagement. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had admitted the gravity of the evil and had pledged himself to deal with the evil as soon as the land question was settled, and if an English Company was allowed by this Bill to get a firm grasp on any Irish system, it would greatly impede the efforts of the right hon. Gentleman in dealing with the question. Irrespective of the influence which the Midland Railway Company was able to exercise in this House, they had a financial capital of one-tenth of all the Railway Stock in the United Kingdom, and the fact had only to be stated to show how enormously any attempt at reform would be impeded. It had been urged that the railway systems of Ireland were worked so badly that it would pass the wit of even Midland directors to introduce anything worse, and with that view he largely agreed, and with proper safeguards they might be allowed to test the matter. But the House had had some experience of railway matters in Ireland, and they had no guarantee that this company would not pursue a similar course to the Great Southern and Western Railway, whose broken pledges to Parliament were a very grave scandal. This company had not made any effort to satisfy the public on that point, and that being so, he trusted that the House would send back this Bill. He hoped the House would be more ready to adopt this course, because this was one of the few lines in Ireland which could by any means be called progressive.

They would no doubt be told that the Midland Railway Company had their own fixed rates, which were lower than the rates upon this railway, but there was no guarantee that the same rates would prevail over this line now under consideration. Why the Midland Railway Company had 25,000,000 goods rates, and who could hope to make head or tail of such a mass of rates as that. Moreover, those rates though equitable on the Midland system in England, might be quite inequitable on the line it was proposed to acquire in Ireland. High rates for the carriage of linen, for instance, would injure Ireland, but it would not injure England, whereas high rates for coal would injure England much more than Ireland, and to apply these rates to Ireland without their being reviewed by a Committee would be most unjust. The Great Southern and Western Railway Bills attempted to force all traffic possible through the ports of Rosslare and Fishguard, and in the case of this Bill everything possible would be done to force traffic through Belfast. It was for this House to consider whether it would not be better to secure for the people a fair revision of the rates which they had to pay on their merchandise. At the present time Belfast competed with French net spinners and manufacturers. France was able to throw these goods on the English market at a cost of 28s. 9d. a ton, whilst the Irish manufacturer had to pay 40s. to bring his wares to the same market. Indeed, so high were the charges for conveyance of goods on Irish railways that it had been proved that a considerable sum of money could be saved by sending goods from Belfast to Liverpool and from Liverpool across again to the town in Ireland to which the goods were to be delivered, instead of sending them direct by train from Belfast. Danish butter from Copenhagen could be landed at Liverpool at a carriage rate of 20s. a ton, but Irish butter from Cookstown cost 27s. 6d. From Copenhagen to Manchester it was 35s., from Cookstown to Manchester it was 37s. 6d. Canadian butter came over at a cost of 40s. a ton, whereas to send butter from Derry to Nottingham cost 46s. It was impossible under such circumstances that Irish produce could compete with foreign in the English markets. It must also be remembered that these rates which were charged on the Irish Railways were in most cases fixed and controlled by English companies interested in those railways. If he had the purse of the Midland and Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Companies he could get resolutions passed by the District Councils and the County Councils either for or against this Bill. [Cries of "No, no."] It only required to be brought home to the District and County Councils in Ireland that this was a fight to obtain fair rates, and then there would be petitions from every District and County Council in Ireland against this Bill. He moved the rejection of the Bill.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S) formally seconded.

Amendment proposed.

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. MacVeagh.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

SIR CHARLES RENSHAW (Renfrew, W.) reminded the House that the whole question of railway rates in Ireland and Scotland was regulated by the Board of Trade. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: And they do it very badly.] That was a question upon which he did not think the House was called upon to express an opinion on this occasion. The course suggested by the hon. Member for South Down had no precedent in the procedure of the House. He hoped this Bill would be given a Second Reading, and that it would be sent to a Committee upstairs where the details might be threshed out.

*MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.) dissociated himself from the remark made by the hon. Member for South Down in which he asserted that if he had the purse of the Midland Company he could influence the local bodies in Ireland either way in regard to this measure.

MR. MACVEAGH explained that what he said was that if he had the purse of the Midland and Northern Counties Railway Companies he could place facts before them which would induce them to send petitions against this Bill.

*MR. O'DOHERTY said the hon. Member for South Down was mistaken when he said that the Port and Harbours Commissioners of Londonderry had asked the House to reject this Bill; they had done nothing of the kind. The Commissioners required certain instructions given to the Committee, in order that the trade and commerce of the port of Londonderry would be properly safeguarded.

MR. MACVEAGH said a telegram had been issued stating that the Port and Harbour Commissioners of Londonderry earnestly appealed to the House to reject this Bill, or at least to get certain instructions inserted in Committee.

*MR. O'DOHERTY said that the Port and Harbour Commissioners were in favour, and had given instructions to those hon. Members whom they could influence to vote for the Bill—in fact, the whole trade and commerce, not only of Londonderry, but also of the north of Ireland, were in favour of this Bill. The hon. Member for South Down said the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Company would be managed in the future by foreigners. Evidently the hon. Member had not read the Bill, which provided that there was to be a Committee to regulate all Irish traffic, this Committee to be composed of three local North of Ireland gentlemen and three directors of the Midland Railway. He thought it would appeal to hon. Members when he said that there was not a single constituency through which this line would pass whose representative would not record his vote in favour of this Bill. The Midland Railway had not a bad record with them in the north of Ireland; they had put their hands in their pockets deeply in order to develop the industrial resources of the county of Donegal. This Company had been instrumental in constructing twenty or thirty miles of light railways through Donegal, and they were engaged in constructing other lines in that county. The more railways they had in Ireland, and the more inducements they could hold out to English capitalists to invest their money in Ireland, the better. He did not believe in monopolies, and he hoped the House would pass this Bill, as if they did not the chances would be that the Great Northern Railway of Ireland would acquire and thereby create a monopoly in the North of Ireland.

COL. M'CALMONT (Antrim, E.) said he should support the Second Reading. The hon. Member who had just sat down had enlightened them very much as to the purport of the Bill. All the public bodies in the North-East of Ireland had shown that they desired that this Bill should pass. He could not imagine anything more advantageous than the advent of a great company like the Midland Railway, with its great capital and unlimited resources. He hoped the House would approve of the principle of the Bill by passing the Second Reading, and allow the details to be settled in Committee. The position of Derry and other places would be fairly and squarely considered, and the rates could not possibly be raised without the consent of the Railway Commissioners.

MR. O'KELLY (Mayo, N.) said the statement made by the hon. Member for South Down about being able to influence public bodies in Ireland if he had the purse of this Company at his disposal was absolutely untrue. He wished to protest against such a remark, and he should support the Second Reading. The County Councils of Ireland had a sufficient defence for the integrity with which they had discharged their duties, in the repeated vindication they had received from the Local Government Board of Ireland.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.) said nothing could be more calculated to advance the material interests of Ireland than the existence of lines of railway competing for the carriage of Irish goods to different markets in England. He could not, therefore, understand the objection to a Bill which would enable a rich and powerful English company to join with some of the local Irish railway companies in increasing and developing the means of cheap and rapid goods traffic between Ireland and England, although they might differ as to the terms to be imposed upon this company; these might very well form the subjects of discussion before the Committee; he could not understand how hon. Members from Ireland could oppose this Bill. Points of detail could be legitimately discussed in Committee, and he heartily supported the Second Reading.

MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.) said his constituents were very much interested in this Bill, because the principal town in North Tyrone, which he had the honour of representing, was directly interested in having as easy and cheap means of communication between England and the different ports of Ireland as possible. All they wanted in Ireland was capital, and if they had sufficient capital they would be about the most flourishing and the happiest people on the face of the earth. He was inclined to support the Second Reading, but he was rather afraid of the overwhelming power of this great English company, which might swallow and devour all that came in its way in a poor country like Ireland. There were Motions on the Paper to refer this Bill to a hybrid Committee, and if that course were taken, the object of the hon. Member for South Down would be achieved. If the instruction of the noble Lord the Member for Londonderry were carried, then Irish interests would be safeguarded, and the danger of heavy rates being charged would be greatly obviated. He appealed to the hon. Member for South Down to withdraw his Motion and let the House proceed to consider the instructions.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said he thought the remark of his hon. friend the Member for South Down had been misunderstood. Several speakers seemed to be under the impression that the hon. Member for South Down made a wholesale accusation of corruption against the public bodies of Ireland. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: "So he did."]

He was perfectly certain that the hon. Member for South Down intended to make no such accusation as that, for such a charge would be absolutely absurd to anyone at all acquainted with public life in Ireland since the Local Government Act was passed. Every one knew that not only in business capacity, but in purity also, those public bodies were quite able to hold their own with public bodies either in England or Scotland. What his hon. friend meant was, that a great wealthy English corporation like the Midland Railway Company, was by the mere fact of its influence, power, and wealth, able to create a public opinion in its favour; but to say that this company would be able to obtain petitions and resolutions for or against any public measure in Ireland was a statement which could not be supported, and he was quite sure the Member for South Down never meant that.

Whatever view might be taken as to the desirability of passing the Second Reading of this Bill, he sympathised very much with the object which his hon. friend the Member for South Down had in raising this discussion. His hon. friend called attention to what had been going on in Ireland in regard to the acquisition of a number of Irish railway lines by great English railway companies. It did not meet the objection to tell him that these great companies might manage the lines better than the existing Irish companies managed them. They looked forward to the day when there would be a radical reform in the whole question of railway transit in Ireland. He personally looked forward to the day when there might be in Ireland something in the nature of a nationalisation of Irish railways. It might not come for some time: it might not come until they had a local governing body in Ireland; but when the time did come for carrying out the reform, the difficulties in the way of carrying it out would undoubtedly be considerably increased if at that time all the Irish railways were in the hands of great English companies. He thought his hon. friend, from that point of view, was perfectly justified in calling attention to this matter.

The Attorney-General had rightly told the House that one of the great difficulties from which Ireland was suffering at this moment was to be found in the deficient facilities for the carriage of goods in the country, and the hon. and learned Gentleman was disposed to give his support to the Bill on the supposition that if the Midland Company got possession of the line the facilities in that part of Ireland would be improved. His hon. friend's second objection to the Second Reading of the Bill was that there was no undertaking whatever that the rates which obtained even on the Midland lines in England would be extended to this Irish line when acquired by them. It seemed to him that his hon. friend would be wise if he did not divide the House against the Second Reading, but trusted to the discussion next time it came up, on the "instruction" which stood in his name, calling upon the Committee to insist on the railway company inserting in the Bill certain provisions with reference to rates. There was a further instruction on the Paper asking that the Bill should be referred to a hybrid Committee. He thought that was a reasonable proposal also. He did not know who was in charge of the Bill on behalf of the promoters, but he was quite sure that if they would give an assurance that they would agree to a proposal of that kind there would be no objection to passing the Second Reading. He had intervened in the debate because he thought his hon. friend, whose intentions were perfectly good, had been misunderstood by a large number of the Members of the House. He offered to his hon. friend the same suggestion which the Attorney-General had already offered, namely, that the question of rates should be left to be threshed out when the instruction came up, and that they should press the necessity of sending the Bill to a hybrid Committee.

The Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill read a second time.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (GENERAL POWERS) BILL (BY ORDER).

Sir FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) moved an instruction to the Committee on this Bill to omit Clauses 63 and 64. He thought it would save the time of the House if he read the Clauses to which he referred.

Clause 63 was as follows—

"It shall be lawful for the Council of any Metropolitan Borough being authorised to supply and supplying electrical energy to expend money upon the wiring and fitting and supplying with wires fittings and apparatus the premises of their consumers or prospective consumers and to enter into and carry into effect Agreements and arrangements with respect thereto and to make such charges therefor whether directly or otherwise as they may think fit."

Clause 64 was in these terms—

"Any such Council of a Metropolitan Borough may borrow in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as if such expenditure were for the purposes of the Electric Lighting Acts 1882 and 1888 such sums of money as may be required by such Council for the purposes hereinbefore mentioned."

These Clauses raised a very important question as to the extent to which municipalities should be empowered to enter into competition with retail traders. It might be held that it was advantageous to everyone that municipalities should be allowed to own gasworks, electric light works, tramways, and waterworks, but he thought it could not be admitted that it was advisable for municipalities to enter into retail trading, and to compete directly with the various manufacturers and shopkeepers of this country. If a man wanted his house fitted with wires, or desired to buy an electric lamp, the Council wanted to supply him instead of a retail trader doing so. He was sure every business man in the House would agree with him when he said that if one entered into a business of this description it must be managed by a man who understood the business. He wanted to know how it was possible that the London County Council or a borough council could enter into a business of this kind with the slightest hope that it would be remunerative. In the last few years there had been an alarming increase in the indebtedness of municipalities. Only to-day he saw in the papers that the Finance Committee of the London County Council proposed to borrow £18,000,000 in the next eighteen months. In the face of that it was absolute rashness to allow them to enter into retail trade of this description. If trading of this description were authorised, he did not know where it was possible to draw the line. They might have municipal bakeries and shops of every description. He thought there were few Members of the House who desired that such a state of things should be brought about.

*SIR WILLIAM TOMLINSON (Preston) seconded the Motion. He pointed out the unfair competition to which private traders would be subjected by reason of borough councils carrying on the business of electric-light fitting. Every private trader had to find the capital for carrying on his business, and he had to carry it on with the expectation of being paid by his customers in a reasonable time. Under the proposal now made he would have to compete with a body having unlimited capital raised from rates to which he contributed, and not requiring early repayment of the cost of the fittings. The London County Council had issued a statement in support of the retention of these clauses in the Bill, in which it was stated that the cost of equipping premises for the use of electricity would be recovered by a little increased charge for a certain period for the electric current supply. The repayment would thus be effected by instalments spread over a period of years. That statement was alone sufficient to condemn the two clauses. The County Council carried on their business by capital borrowed on the security of the rates, and it was unjust to expose small private traders to the competition of a great public corporation financed in this manner.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the London County Council (General Powers) Bill to omit Clauses 63 and 64."—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said this was not a County Council Bill at all in the sense in which the hon. Member for Peckham had represented, and it was as well that the House should remember the facts. He thought they had a right to be informed what the proposals were. The two Clauses were not initiated by the London County Council, although they found a place in the General Powers Bill. The borough councils of London who were empowered to supply electric light desired also to supply fittings, just as a company did; and, to save expense and Parliamentary time, they agreed with the County Council for the insertion of the clauses in the General Powers Bill instead of bringing in twenty-seven separate Bills. Of the whole number of councils eighteen were in favour of the clauses and only two opposed to them. The two which were against the clauses, represented districts which were served by electric light companies which, as compared with municipal electric works, overcharged the ratepayers and served them very badly indeed. It was curious to remember that in Westminster the electric supply agents lived more by the sale of German than British fittings. Let the hon. Member move an instruction that all fittings should be made in Britain; he did not object to Ireland, and would say the United Kingdom. Eighteen borough councils were in favour of the clauses, four were neutral, and only two against them, and the latter two boroughs were supplied with electric light by companies. He came now to another argument. Did any other Town Council enjoy these powers? He was sorry to tell the hon. Member for Peckham that his brief had been badly prepared, because many provincial towns enjoyed these and even wider powers.

SIR F. BANBURY: I am sorry to hear it.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The hon. Member ought to have lived in the time of Noah's Ark. No fewer than twenty-six provincial Town Councils had had conferred upon them by Parliament, without opposition, what the London Borough Councils, by decided majorities, demanded. What was the reason of that? Because it enabled the councils to supply electric light at a cheaper rate. In Battersea, where the Borough Council had installed the electric light only two years ago, the charge was only 4d. per unit, whereas in the next parish, Wandsworth, where the electric light had been established by a company for ten years, the charge was 10d. per unit. The fact was that, wherever in London they had a company supplying electric light, there the price was higher than where it was done by municipal enterprise.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY said his argument did not bear upon the supply of electric light, but upon the setting up of retail shops to supply fittings.

MR. JOHN BURNS said it stood to reason that if the Borough Councils could supply the major requirement, viz., electric light, 50 per cent. cheaper, they could do the same with the minor, viz., fittings. At present, where the electric light was supplied by companies, its consumption was practically restricted to the well-to-do or rich people, because the would-be poor consumer was unable to put down a lump sum for fittings and installation; but the Borough Councils were able to make an installation and cover the expense over a long period. There were in this city something like 2,000 churches and chapels, the bulk of which were living from hand to mouth, from the point of view of financial resources, and it was impossible for the average church or chapel to instal the electric light. This they would do if the Borough Councils had the power of extending the period for repayment of the installation. They all knew that in these days it was advisable to keep the ecclesiastical atmosphere cool, and in this respect the electric light had an advantage over gas. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich should welcome this advantage in the coolness of the atmosphere for religious discussions. In his own district a parson of the noble Lord's persuasion had asked him why it was that the companies could not instal electric light in their churches cheaper than was now the rule; and his answer was, simply because the private companies would not wait six, nine, or twelve months for their money, as Borough Councils could do. The result was that electric lighting was a luxury for the rich and not for the poor. He now came to the commercial argument. The hon. Member for Peckham was under the impression that the Borough Councils asked the power to manufacture the fittings. That was not the case; they only wished to supply the fittings in the houses where the light was installed by them. Some hon. Members said that that would diminish the sale of fittings. On the contrary, the cheaper the electric light was made, the more fittings would be required and installed. If the House were to adopt the reactionary views of the hon. Member the manufacture and supply of fittings would be retarded. His last argument was how much longer was this House to have its time wasted with the discussion of these Instructions to Committees upstairs. This General Powers Bill of the London County Council had passed its Second Reading *sub silentio*, but these Instructions to the Committee were afterwards put down on the Paper.

SIR WILLIAM TOMLINSON said that he had put down his Instructions before the Second Reading came on.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY said that his also were put down before the Second Reading.

MR. JOHN BURNS said that these contradictions only went half-way. The Bill had been before the House for six weeks, and the Instructions were not put down until the Second Reading of the Bill was fixed. Why should there be these discussions by the House of Commons on these Instructions, which fettered the discretion of the Committees on small petty details. Why not leave to the Committees a free selection of alternative proposals? These Instructions were becoming so frequent that the House of Commons, instead of being what it ought to be, a National Assembly, an Imperial Parliament, was becoming a glorified Municipal Council dealing with gas pipes and electric fittings, which was not its proper function. He believed that the proposal of the hon. Member for Peckham would damage trade, while the clauses in the Bill would tend to extend trade and increase the supply of electric light, which would make our poorer homes much healthier than when gas was employed for lighting purposes. At the present moment the Borough Council in his constituency were building 400 artisans' cottages, in which the electric light would be installed with 1d. and 2d. in the slot meters. The

Borough Council which supplied the electric light ought not to be compelled to force the owners of these cottages to use gas or to go to foreign agents who employed foreign workmen for their electric light fittings. He asked the House to rise superior to the hon. Member for Peckham's patronage of foreign industry.

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE (Camberwell, Dulwich) said he wished to take the House back from the high-flown remarks of the hon. Member for Battersea to the really business side of this question. The supply of electric wiring and fittings to all the houses in the Metropolis would amount in costto many millions of money. It meant an enormous number of showrooms with electric fittings, an enormous number of electrical engineers and electrical inspectors, all to be paid by the Borough Councils. This was a different question from the supply of gas fittings, which were generally put in by the landlord. Speaking as a large ratepayer in the city, he maintained that it would be most unsafe to allow twenty-nine Borough Councils to go into this trading business with many million pounds worth of stock owed for by the different tenants to the municipalities. Speaking not as a director of a company, but as a shopkeeper, of which he was not ashamed, he insisted that if they wanted to do good business each Borough Council would require to get a good man at the head of the electrical department with a salary of, perhaps, £1,000 a year, and three or four inspectors with salaries of £300 or £400 a year. Then who was to prove that the wiring and the fittings had only cost the money which they were estimated at? He was sure that the ratepayers would be called upon to make good very large sums of money lost through the tenants. He thought the House would be wise in accepting his hon. friend's Motion.

*MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said he apologised for interfering in the discussion, because he was not a London Member. The Town Council in the largest town in his constituency, Barnstaple, had set up electric lighting works, but when these were completed they found themselves in this difficulty, that the majority of the would-be consumers could not pay at once for the fittings. The Members of the Town Council were business men, and they came to the conclusion that as the state had given them the power, they should furnish the fittings provided that there would be no charge on the rates. Accordingly they devised a method by which the customers got their fittings, which were paid for by instalments. It was at once seen that not only would the electric light be beneficial to the town, but it would contribute to a small reduction in the rates. The position was satisfactory both to the ratepayers and the consumers; but, unfortunately, two months ago a director of the local gas company had issued a writ against the Town Council.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! This Bill does not relate to Barnstaple. The question before the House is whether it is desirable to give this Instruction to the Committee on the London County Council Bill.

*MR. SOARES: I merely wished to prove to the President of the Board of Trade that the principle contained in the clauses now under discussion is *sub judice*, and that the action might be affected by the debate.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I don't think so. It would not affect the action.

MR. WHITMORE (Chelsea) said that although a great part of such Bills was non-controversial, they might contain clauses embodying principles which hon. Members thought dangerous, and the only course open to them was to move an Instruction to the Committee. He deplored the necessity for putting down these Instructions, but he maintained that they were forced to move them because of the unfortunate habit into which the County Council had fallen of merging all sorts of matters into its private Bills. The hon. Member for Battersea seemed to think that hon. Members on the Conservative side of the House would accept any legislation, however bad, if it were promoted by the

Borough Councils, but that they objected to anything put forward by the County Council. That was a most illogical argument, and he would reply that he objected to these particular clauses because he thought they were an undue, unfair, and uneconomical interference on the part of municipal bodies with the freedom and proper exercise of their rights by private traders

*MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) agreed, on the other hand, that the clauses were most reasonable because they were permissive in their character. They were inserted at the request of the Borough Councils, and the powers sought were the necessary complement of the powers which that House had already conferred on the Borough Councils. It would not be wise to leave it to private enterprise to supply all these fittings. A public authority was far more likely to introduce all the newest inventions, and a proof of that was afforded by the result of the "penny-in-the-slot" system of supplying gas. He appealed to Metropolitan Members opposite not to support this Instruction.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon) oped the House would bring the discussion to an end in view of the fact that some important financial business had yet to be transacted that night.

*MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster) said the hon. Member for Battersea had made an impassioned appeal against the time of the House being wasted on these instructions, and had asked if Parliament was to be put on the same footing as Borough Councils by being asked to deal with electric fittings and such small things. But the question at issue was far larger than that, and he would ask how long was the time of the House to be wasted by these attempts to municipalise the industries of the country, a practice which he ventured to say was inconsistent with the past history, and threatening to the future commercial prosperity of the nation? This was only one part of a great scheme of such municipalisation, and he ventured to assert that the County Council were only proposing to confer these powers on the Borough Councils in order that they might shield their general policy behind the local bodies and secure their support for further steps in the same direction.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes 126; Noes 109. (Division List No. 39.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anstruther, H. T.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (*Hornsey*
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H
Cavendish, V C W (*Derbysh.*)
Cecil, Evelyn (*Aston Manor*)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (*Greenwich*)
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Cox, Irwin Edwd. Bainbridge
Cranborne, Lord
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Jos. C.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Ed.
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (*Man'r*
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (*Warwick, S.W.*
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H (*City of Lond*
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (*Elgin & Nrn*
Gore, Hn G R. C. Ormsby-(*Salop*
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (*Linc*
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld. G. (*Midx*
Hamilton, Marq. of (*Londondy*
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Heath, Arthur H. (*Hanley*)
Heath, James (*Staffords. N. W.*
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hogg, Lindsay
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (*Salop*
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas, Col. Francis (*Lowestoft*
Lucas, Reginald J. (*Portsmouth*
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (*Liverpool*)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Killop, Jas. (*Stirlingshire*)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt Hn. Sir H E (*Wigt'n*
Milvain, Thomas

Mitchell, William
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (*Hants.*
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (*Walthamstow*)
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (*Bute*
Murray, Col. Wyndham (*Bath*)
Myers, William Henry
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (*Greenock*)
Remnant, Jas. Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (*Stalybridge*
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson
Rose, Charles Day
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Saml. Alexander
Smith, Jas. Parker (*Lanarks.*)
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (*Strand*)
Stanley, Lord (*Lancs.*)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir Jn. M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (*Chichester*)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (*Oxf'd Univ*
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. J. Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. S. (*York, E. R.*)
Wilson John (*Glasgow*)
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (*Yorks.*)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (*Bath*
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Frederick Banbury and Sir Wm. Tomlinson.

NOES.

Abraham, W. (*Cork, N.E.*)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (*Middx.*)
Brigg, John
Brown, Geo. M. (*Edinburgh*)
Bryce, Right Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Clancy, John Joseph
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Corbett, A. Cameron (*Glasg.*)
Corbett, T. L. (*Down, North*)
Craig, Robert Hunter (*Lanark*
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (*Carmarthen*)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (*Cardign*
Dewar, John A. (*Inverness-sh.*)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duffy, William J.
Edwards, Frank
Fenwick, Charles
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Sir Walter (*Derby Co.*
Gardner, Ernest
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Gordon, Maj Evans- (*Tr. Hmlts*
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jones, Wm. (*Carnarvonshire*)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Labouchere, Henry
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (*Monm'th*)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Killop, W. (*Sligo, North*)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benj.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (*Carmarthen*
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (*Louth, S.*)
O'Brien, Patrick (*Kilkenny*)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (*Mayo, N.*)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Peel, Hn. Wm. R. Wellesley
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, William (*Clare*)
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (*Eifion*)
Roberts, Samuel (*Sheffield*)
Robertson, H. (*Hackney*)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbt. L. (*Cleveland*)
Seely, Chas. Hilton (*Lincoln*)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (*Forfarshire*)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (*Northants*
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Austin (*East Toxteth*)
Tennant, Harold John
Thornton, Percy M.
Wason, E. (*Clackmannan*)
Wason, J. Cathcart (*Orkney*)
White, George (*Norfolk*)
White, Luke (*York, E. R.*)
Whiteley, G. (*York, W. R.*)
Whitley, J. H. (*Halifax*)
Wilson, John (*Falkirk*)
Wilson, J. W. (*Worcestersh., N.*

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Lough and Mr. John Burns.

SUPPLY [19TH MARCH].

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [23rd March], "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the Resolution:—'That a sum, not exceeding £20,265,000, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for or towards defraying the Charges for the following Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1904,'" viz:—

CIVIL SERVICES.

CLASS II.

	£
Colonial Office - - -	25,000

CLASS IV.

Board of Education - -	6,000,000

CLASS II.

	£
Board of Agriculture	65,000

CLASS III.

Crofters Commission, Scotland	2,000

CLASS I.

Royal Palaces and Marlborough House	40,000
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens	50,000
Houses of Parliament Buildings	16,000
Miscellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain	30,000
Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain	20,000
Diplomatic and Consular Buildings	18,000
Revenue Buildings	225,000
Public Buildings, Great Britain	225,000
Surveys of the United Kingdom	90,000
Harbours under the Board of Trade	7,000
Peterhead Harbour	6,000
Rates on Government Property	250,000
Public Works and Buildings, Ireland	110,000
Railways, Ireland	80,000

CLASS II.

United Kingdom and England :—

	£
House of Lords Offices	2,000
House of Commons Offices	12,000
Treasury and Subordinate Departments	40,000
Home Office	60,000
Foreign Office	30,000
Privy Council Office, &c.	5,000
Board of Trade	75,000
Mercantile Marine Services	30,000
Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade	3
Charity Commission	15,000
Civil Service Commission	18,000
Exchequer and Audit Department	25,000
Friendly Societies Registry	3,000
Local Government Board	85,000
Lunacy Commission	5,000
Mint (including Coinage)	5
National Debt Office	6,000
Public Record Office	10,000
Public Works Loan Commission	5
Registrar-General's Office	19,000
Stationery and Printing	320,000
Woods, Forests, &c., Office of	8,000
Works and Public Buildings, Office of	30,000
Secret Service	40,000

Scotland :—

Secretary for Scotland	25,000
Fishery Board	8,000
Lunacy Commission	3,000
Registrar-General's Office	5,000
Local Government Board	6,000

Ireland :—

Lord-Lieutenant's Household	2,000
Chief Secretary for Ireland	16,000
Department of Agriculture	75,000
Charitable Donations and Bequests Office	1,000
Local Government Board	25,000
Public Record Office	2,000
Public Works Office	18,000
Registrar-General's Office	6,000
Valuation and Boundary Survey	7,000

CLASS III.

United Kingdom and England :—

Law Charges	35,000
Miscellaneous Legal Expenses	27,000
Supreme Court of Judicature	140,000
Land Registry	20,000
County Courts	8,000
Police, England and Wales	18,000
Prisons, England and the Colonies	340,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain	140,000
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum	14,000

Scotland :—

Law Charges and Courts of Law	30,000
Register House, Edinburgh	15,000
Prisons, Scotland	40,000

Ireland :—

Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions	35,000
Supreme Court of Judicature, and other Legal Departments	45,000
Land Commission	55,000
County Court Officers, etc.	46,000
Dublin Metropolitan Police	45,000
Royal Irish Constabulary	600,000
Prisons, Ireland	50,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools	55,000
Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum	3,000

Class IV.

United Kingdom and England :—	£
British Museum - - -	80,000
National Gallery - - -	10,000
National Portrait Gallery -	3,000
Wallace Collection - -	4,000
Scientific Investigation, etc., United Kingdom - -	22,000
Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales - -	42,000
Scotland :—	
Public Education - - -	750,000
National Gallery - - -	3,000
Ireland :—	
Public Education - - -	730,000
Endowed Schools Commissioners	400
National Gallery - - -	3,000
Queen's Colleges - - -	2,500

Class V.

Diplomatic and Consular Services - - - -	250,000
Uganda, Central and East Africa Protectorates, and Uganda Railway - -	320,000
Colonial Services - - -	300,000
Cyprus, Grant-in-Aid - -	85,000
Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable - - - -	32,000

Class VI.

Superannuation and Retired Allowances - - -	280,000
Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, etc. - - -	2,000
Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances - -	1,000
Hospitals and Charities, Ireland	17,000
Savings Banks and Friendly Societies Deficiencies -	— —

Class VII.

Temporary Commissions - -	25,000
Miscellaneous Expenses - -	16,087
Repayments to the Local Loans Fund - - - -	— —
St. Louis Exhibition, 1904 -	— —
Total for Civil Services	£13,035,000

Revenue Departments.	£
Customs - - - - -	350,000
Inland Revenue - - -	830,000
Post Office - - -	3,800,000
Post Office Packet Service	250,000
Post Office Telegraphs -	2,000,000
Total for Revenue Departments - - -	£7,230,000
Grand Total -	£20,265,000

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

*MR. CATHCART WASON said he wished to appeal to the Lord Advocate to bring his influence to bear on the Government with reference to the condition of the people of South Uist. The houses of the people were built with loose stones, plastered with mud. The family lived at one end, and the cattle at the other; and outbreaks of fever were frequent. That was not fiction. It was contained in the Report issued by the Congested Districts Board of Scotland. Kelp industry had failed in the district, and as it was their one source of obtaining money the people were now absolutely within measurable danger of starvation. In those circumstances he would appeal to the Lord Advocate to recede from the hard and fast line he had taken up, make a full inquiry into the condition of the people, and remove what was a standing disgrace to the British nation.

There was another subject to which he wished to refer, and which he sincerely regretted had not yet received the attention it deserved. That was the recruiting of native labour for the mines in South Africa. The Colonial Office view was stated the other night, and it was to the effect that they could not interfere with the self-governing colonies in such a matter. His reply was that they had already interfered, and not so very long ago. When recruiting was being carried on in the South Sea Islands for slave labour in Queensland very horrible events occurred, and the Government interfered in a very drastic fashion. It was almost impossible to recruit native labour for the mines without bringing about even worse evils than slavery. The last thing the natives wanted was to go down into the bowels of the earth and dig out what appeared to them to be a worthless metal. The natives were perfectly happy in their own little cottages, with their mealie plots and one or more wives. He would ask hon. Members to consider how America acted in this matter. America had got mines in a climate very similar to that of South Africa, but there was no question there of getting slave labour; they paid a white man an honest day's wage for an honest day's labour. The absurd prejudice which a white man had to work with a black or a yellow man should not exist in the British Empire, seeing that the greater proportion of His Majesty's subjects were coloured persons. It was made perfectly clear three years ago that they did not go to war in South Africa for the sake of the mines; but now a different state of affairs had arisen, and they were told that the Government, without consulting the House of Commons or the country, had deliberately given their sanction to the recruiting of 1,000 natives in Central Africa. That was a scandalous proceeding, and would lead to deplorable results, and would besmirch the fair name of this country throughout the world. The great industry in South Africa was not the mining industry. There was a great agricultural future before that country, and it was on agriculture only they could found a condition of permanent prosperity. The mines might bring a little temporary prosperity, but agriculture was the only basis on which any country could rest for prosperity.

Another matter which he wished to bring to the attention of the House was the very unsatisfactory position which existed with reference to the loans guaranteed by certain South African magnates. With regard to that their information was rather limited. They were told that a sum of £30,000,000 had been underwritten.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The loans are not included in the Estimates before the House.

MR. CATHCART WASON said he only wished to point out the position of the mine-owners in South Africa with reference to the loans.

*MR. SPEAKER: I understood the hon. Gentleman was proceeding to discuss the Loan Bills.

MR. CATHCART WASON said he only wished to refer to the unsatisfactory feeling which existed in South Africa with reference to the matter. They were told that certain arrangements had been made; but in South Africa a totally different impression had been created. There it was believed that part of the bargain was that the mine-owners should have sole control over the mining industry. That was the statement of a Mr. Solomon, who was most favourable to the Government. He thought it would be a great pity if the House was not given an opportunity of deciding whether they would have any share whatever in introducing slavery into South Africa. It was slavery, and nothing else; and it was all nonsense to say that the natives wished to work. They only worked under the inducement of high wages, illicit intercourse, illicit drink, or some other inducement of that kind.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said he desired to say a few words on a topic with regard to which it was time that they had some indication of the policy that was being pursued by the Government. That was the question of what was passing in South-Eastern Europe. The House would remember that by the 23rd Article of the Treaty of Berlin, of which this country was a signatory, certain provisions were drawn up for introducing reforms of government and administration into the European provinces of Turkey. A scheme was drawn up by a Commission; and he was sorry the hon. Gentleman the Member for Swindon was not present, as he was one of the Commissioners, and could, no doubt, give the House a great deal of information with reference to the provisions of the scheme. Nothing, however, had been done from that day to this to carry out the provisions of that scheme. This country had a special responsibility in regard to the administration of these provinces over and above the responsibility which belonged to it as one of the signatory Powers, because when the Treaty of San Stefano, which gave nearly the whole of Macedonia to the Principality of Bulgaria, was signed, His Majesty's Government interposed and protested against its provisions. The result was that the Treaty of Berlin was substituted, and that a large strip of territory was cut out from the new Principality of Bulgaria and left under the dominion of Turkey, and the people who would have shared in the prosperity which had attended the Principality of Bulgaria were sent back under the yoke of Turkey. Therefore, a responsibility rested on this country in a special sense to endeavour to secure for the inhabitants of these provinces all that better administration, free government and prosperity which the Principality of Bulgaria had secured for its subjects. Nothing had been done since 1878 to carry out the provisions of the scheme then drawn up. Within the last few weeks an elaborate Blue-book had been issued containing Reports from His Majesty's Consuls and Ambassadors with reference to the state of things in these provinces, and particularly in Macedonia and Albania. Such an amount of controversy and falsehood always attached to everything that came from the East that it was not easy to determine the precise truth; but there appeared to emerge from the data given in the Blue-book, first, that there was a great deal of gross and monstrous maladministration on the part of Turkish officials, and corruption and violence on the part of Turkish tax-gatherers, and, secondly, that there was cruelty and oppression, and that the condition of the people was nearly as bad as ever it had been. As a consequence of this maladministration, there had arisen revolutionary bands which traversed the country with an object mainly political, but which sometimes, it was to be feared, degenerated into brigandage.

These bands were to some extent organised in Bulgaria, and to some extent in Macedonia; and they had practically established a kind of semi-independent government, and were able to carry on a sort of skirmishing warfare with the Turkish police. Under those circumstances, constant pressure was being put on the Bulgarian Government to suppress the agitation so far as it proceeded from the Bulgarian side; and they read in the Blue-book of constant complaints being addressed to the Bulgarian Government, sometimes by the Turkish Government, sometimes by our own Government, sometimes by the Austrian Government, and sometimes by the Russian Government. And the Bulgarian Government apparently tried to do its duty, but it stood in a very difficult position. Half of its officials, according to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, were of Macedonian birth; and there was a large body of Macedonian exiles in Bulgaria who kept up the agitation there, and who had a large influence with the Bulgarian population, who were substantially the same in race and creed as the Bulgarian population in Macedonia. Macedonia consisted of very different elements of population. There was the Bulgarian element, which was the largest, the Servian element, the Greek element, and the Albanian element. Under these circumstances, the sympathy of the Bulgarian population with the people of Macedonia was very strong, and they had both practical and economical reasons for desiring to see Macedonia at peace.

The large immigration of unhappy Macedonian exiles into Bulgaria, fleeing from the maladministration from which they suffered, had created a competition for employment, which pressed very heavily on the native Bulgarian population. The Bulgarian Government had done all that it could be expected to do to keep the agitation quiet; but for the pressure exerted by Austria and Russia, it would not have been able to do as much as it had. Then, in addition to these elements of confusion, there were the lawless, turbulent population of Albania. The Albanians, who were a high-spirited, warlike race who lived for war, and whose delight it was to raid the cattle and the people of their peaceful neighbours, enjoyed practical immunity because of their great hold upon Constantinople. Many of the favourites of the Sultan, many of the leading officials in European Turkey, and many of the strongest and ablest men in the Turkish service, particularly in the military service, were of Albanian origin; they had great influence at the Palace and in every part of Turkish government; consequently, it was almost impossible to get justice done upon an Albanian misdoer. All through the Blue-book there were accounts of the constant attacks by Albanians; even the railway was not safe from their operations, and neither the Turkish forces nor the people themselves were able to cope with the raiders.

From these facts the House could understand what a perfect chaos of disorder and misery existed in the provinces. For many years past things had been going from bad to worse. In 1901 the position became very serious, and it was apprehended that a grave insurrection would break out. In the beginning of 1902 Austria and Russia took the alarm, and put all possible pressure on the Bulgarian Government, who appeared to have done what it could to restrain the revolutionary bands. As the Foreign Secretary had stated, the blame for the revolutionary movement was largely to be attributed to the gross misconduct of the Government, which allowed the territories to degenerate into anarchy. The remedy would be an insurrection, but he feared that an insurrection would be followed by a massacre. Such a catastrophe all would desire to see averted. The fear of the consequences to European peace had led Austria and Russia to frame a scheme under which an Inspector-General was to be appointed, with the consent of the Powers, having the financial control of the revenues, upon which the first charge would be for the maintenance of order and the discharge of public obligations, and this Inspector-General was to be aided by European officials, who were to reorganise the police. It was not an ambitious scheme, but those who felt that they might have to wait a long time to secure a more complete scheme, and then perhaps get it only at the cost of war, would be glad to accept anything which gave a prospect of a better state of things. He therefore did not suggest that this scheme should be rejected, because it did not go so far as they might desire. Given certain conditions, it might do good, those conditions being that a capable and independent man was chosen as Inspector-General, that he was not interfered with by the Turks, that he had a real and effective control of the finance of the province, and was able to apply it to local purposes instead of remitting it to Constantinople, and that he set quickly to work. Under such conditions there would be ample opportunity of introducing changes of great practical moment.

The Government, while declaring the scheme to be incomplete, had said it would be better to have a scheme which could be applied at once than to wait for a better scheme in the circumstances of peril which obtained, and they therefore accepted the scheme subject to the right of suggesting improvements on further consideration. The Turks, to the surprise of the world, at once accepted the scheme, and declared they would extend it to Albania. But the idea of extending it to Albania was absurd, because the Turks had practically no control there, and after the experience of the past, a little scepticism as to their will to carry out these reforms was only natural. As far as could be gathered, nothing had yet been done beyond the selection of Hilmi Pasha to be Inspector-General. The position was one of great danger. Unless the scheme were carried out promptly, and some steps taken to assure the Macedonian insurgents and their Bulgarian sympathisers that something was to be done to end the present disastrous state of affairs, there was a risk of their patience becoming exhausted, and the revolutionary committees and bands resuming their activity. The hands of the Bulgarian Government might be forced; there would be a general insurrection, which might result in a European conflagration, extending far beyond the boundaries of Macedonia itself. It was of the utmost importance that prompt steps should be taken to bring the scheme into operation, and to give a guarantee to the people of Macedonia and Bulgaria that the proposals of the Powers would be carried out. He desired, therefore, to know what steps were being taken; what was the position of the reform scheme; had anything more been done than the appointment of Hilmi Pasha; had steps been taken to appoint the European officials who were to reorganise the *gendarmerie*; what did the Government know about the present condition of the country and the probability of the pressure which had been applied preventing the outbreak of an insurrection; and what the Government contemplated as the proper steps to be taken in the event of the Turks causing further delays. We stood at a most dangerous moment. It was not merely a question of our sympathy with those who suffered from oppression, disorder, and brigandage; it was also a question of averting a general European conflict, and this ought to induce the Government to do all they could to compel the Turkish Government to act promptly in the matter. He asked the Government to confirm the assurance that they would approach this important matter, and would do everything they could to endeavour to second the efforts of Austria and Russia. There was no desire on his part to censure the action of the Government, but he hoped that they would be able to give him a satisfactory answer, and he was confident they would have the general sentiment of the House and the country with them in endeavouring to put more pressure upon the Turkish Government.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): The right hon. Gentleman in his remarks has certainly not exaggerated the state of misgovernment in European Turkey. It is a very old story, and I am sorry to say that, though the story is told and retold, it never seems to get any better. The condition of things is lamentable in Macedonia, but in Albania it is much worse, and practically, in large portions of European Turkey, there is an absence of government. The taxation is heavy and oppressive; many persons are put into prison without trial, and the police and *gendarmerie* are detailed to make good the deficiency in ways that all must condemn. That state of things is not confined to Macedonia, but, on the other hand, I do not think that in what he has said the right hon. Gentleman has quite realised the character of the proceedings of the Macedonian Committee. He has pictured them as patriots with great love for their country, and as pursuing by methods which, if not legitimate, are very nearly legitimate, the end of emancipation. I hardly think the right hon. Gentleman has read with as much care as I have done the Papers on the subject which have been laid before Parliament. The proceedings of the Macedonian Committee are of a very extreme character indeed. Murder and outrage of different kinds are as much the disgrace of the Macedonian Committee as of the Turkish Government. Take murder for murder, you will find more committed by the Macedonian Committee than by the representatives of the Turkish Government. For a long time the methods the Turks adopted to repress disorder were characterised by great moderation. The regular troops were kept perfectly under control, but as the rebellion proceeded and the agitation increased, against the advice of the representatives of the European Powers at Constantinople, the Turkish Government were unwise enough to use some of their irregular Militia, and the ordinary consequences followed. But I do not think even those troops proceeded to such extremities as did the emissaries of the Macedonian Committee. I should like to read a short passage from a despatch of Consul-General Sir A. Biliotti forwarded by Sir N. O'Conor. It is as follows—

> "Proselytism and terrorism were the means by which they sought to destroy all tranquillity,

and to reduce the inhabitants of the district to such complete misery as would force them to fall in with their revolutionary ideas. The priests and the schoolmasters, working with the daily increasing bands at their backs, instilled into the minds of the peasants that they must look for relief to Bulgaria and prepare for the great struggle which should give liberty to their children. Little by little they removed all who, faithful to the Patriarchate, refused their allegiance; and in the Sandjak of Serres alone over one hundred Greeks, Vlachs, and Orthodox Bulgarians fell victims to their vengeance and cruelty."

In his speech the right hon. Gentleman spoke of the inhabitants of Macedonia as being substantially the same in name and in speech.

MR. BRYCE: Everyone knows there are all sorts and races in Macedonia, but the majority are Bulgarians in race and speech.

*LORD CRANBORNE: Yes, the majority is a very large one in some cases. But the Macedonian Committee not only murdered the Turks but also the Greeks who differed from them. A sound view of the state of things in European Turkey cannot be obtained until it is realised that, bad as is the Government of Turkey, the atrocities are not confined to the Turks, but are the ordinary method of extreme political discussion in these unfortunate countries. I do not think that is any excuse for the Turks, for two reasons. In the first place, the Turks represent the Government, and the iniquities done by the Bulgarians and Macedonians do not excuse them in retorting in kind. In the second place, the Turks are bound by treaties to Europe to introduce reforms and bring about a better state of things in Macedonia. Although their obligation is of a very old date, they have done practically nothing to fulfil it. It was therefore a matter of great satisfaction to His Majesty's Government when the Austrian and Russian Governments came forward with their scheme, which, if carried out, will be in itself effective to a very substantial degree. The question is, Will it be carried out? We have been so often disappointed that no one can speak with confidence on the matter; but I believe the Inspector-General, Hilmi Pasha, is a strong and well-meaning man, and he has certainly shown in the proceedings which have hitherto characterised his tenure of office that he realises the responsibility of his position. He has put a great many evil-doers in prison, while he has released a great number of political prisoners, and he has removed several incompetent Valis; and on the whole I may say that considering the short time he has been in office he has shown every prospect of being equal to the situation. One of His Majesty's Consuls says in a report that Hilmi Pasha has worked hard and unceasingly since his arrival, and has done work that he ought to have been allowed to undertake long ago. He does what he can to ensure justice to each case; he has no time either to eat or to sleep, and his good will is beyond question. He is in telegraphic communication with the Kaimakams, and has dismissed several incompetent minor officials, whilst the Albanians already fear his very name. So far as that goes it is a good character for a Turkish Governor. I cannot help thinking that if he is left alone he may produce substantially good results. It is essential that should be done, and the most important part of the Austro-Russian scheme is the clause that gives a fixity of tenure for three years.

The right hon. Gentleman asks whether the European experts have been appointed under the scheme to assist in the reorganisation of the police and *gendarmerie*. The Government have no reason to suppose that anything has yet been done in that direction, but the Sultan seems to have sanctioned the scheme, not only in the province of Macedonia, but in the other provinces in European Turkey, and if a strong governor like Hilmi Pasha is left undisturbed for three years, we may rely upon it that substantial results will follow. It is most important that he should be left alone, and therefore I should much regret anything being said here that would give the least hope to these agitators and emissaries of the Macedonian Committee that if they attempted to disturb what, if not very much, is at least something in the way of reform, they would receive any support or countenance from the Powers of Europe. We must be content to allow this experiment to work, and we should be doing nothing but the greatest disservice, not only to our own interests, which are very important, but to the interests of the subject populations, if by any expression of sympathy, however well deserved we might deem it to be, we allowed these Macedonian revolutionists to imagine that in spite of the Austro-Russian Scheme being in operation, Europe would support an appeal to a violent revolution. I hope nothing of the kind will happen, and on the other hand, that on this last occasion almost, Turkey will be wise and will recognise the enormous importance of making the experiment of good government a success. After all she must realise the fact that in the scheme no injury is done to the integrity of her dominions. The Sultan will still enjoy the sovereignty over those provinces, and the allegiance of these populations. All Europe recognises the immense difficulty of the problem to be solved, and above all, we say that to excite the terror and fanaticism of the Moslem would be almost worse than anything else. We also recognise that one of the greatest difficulties which the Inspector-General will encounter in restoring order is the discredit into which the Turkish Government has fallen, owing to which any act of his is open to a sort of suspicion. It is to be hoped that the presence of the European experts will give a guarantee and assurance to Europe that the repression of disorder is being carried out with moderation, and with no unnecessary severity, and that the slow process of recreating a Government may be allowed to proceed undisturbed.

For ourselves we are quite ready to play our part as signatories to the treaty of Berlin. That is due to the peace of Europe, and any assistance which the Consular representatives of His Majesty can give in watching over the progress of these reforms, and in making suggestions where they can in agreement with the representatives of Austria and Russia, they will be prepared to give upon our instructions. The other Papers to which the right hon. Gentleman referred are in a very forward state, but I cannot name the day when they will be presented, although I hope it will be within a few days. There is no desire on the part of the Government to keep information from this House which ought to be given. On the contrary the Government rely upon the House to assist them in doing what they can to further the scheme upon which the Austrian and Russian Governments have entered. They hope thereby that it may restore some kind of order and comfort to these unfortunate people without disturbing the political situation in European Turkey, and thus bringing about a greater evil to that part of the world.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye) expressed some disappointment that no more definite announcement had been made by the Under-Secretary with regard to the European *gendarmerie*, and that no assurance had been given that a greater amount of work was being done by non-Turkish subjects. Past experience taught them that the better disposed was the Turkish Governor the greater were the intrigues to undermine the work with which he was engaged. That was all the more reason why Europeans should be on the spot. He strongly appealed to the Government to do everything they could by amicable pressure, or by any other method for the purpose of securing a speedy organisation of the mixed forces of the *gendarmerie* under European officers. It was only in that way there could be the slightest hope of the maintenance of peace in that region. Both the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bryce) and the Under-Secretary appeared to think that the Bulgarian element played a more important part than was actually the case. Any action taken by the Government should be taken not with the view of supporting especially any one race, but to secure that all races should have a perfectly fair and equal field. If there was any one race to which the country should show special favour it would be rather the Greeks, with which race our permanent interests were more closely identified. The treaty of San Stefano emancipated Macedonia from Turkish rule, but the treaty of Berlin restored that province to Turkey, and it was the duty of all countries involved in the latter treaty to see that good order and government were secured so long as it remained in force, and that the population of the country, to whatever race they belonged, were not the losers by the change.

Question put and agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS [19TH MARCH].—REPORT.

Resolutions reported.

1. "That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the years ending on the 31st day of March 1902 and 1903, the sum of £1,520,704 15s. 5d. be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."

2. "That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1904, the sum of £38,997,200 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."

Resolutions agreed to; Bill ordered to be brought in by The Deputy-Chairman, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Hayes Fisher.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (No. 1) BILL.

"To apply certain sums out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the years ending on the thirty-first day of March one thousand nine hundred and two, one thousand nine hundred and three, and one thousand nine hundred and four," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time this day.

Adjourned at two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

APPENDIX I.

MEMORANDUM OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR RELATING TO THE ARMY ESTIMATES FOR 1903–04.

The total of the Army Estimates for 1903–04, together with the Ordnance Factories' Vote and special expenditure in South Africa, including payment of compensation claims, amounts to 34,500,000*l.*, while the number of men to be voted is 235,761.

The following table shows the comparison with the figures for the current year:—

	1903–04.	1902–03.	Increase.	Decrease.
	£	£	£	£
Normal services - - - - - -	27,588,000	27,483,713	104,287	..
Temporary services (reserve of stores and clothing, special programme) - - -	2,157,000	1,822,000	335,000	..
Ordnance Factories' Vote - - - - -	255,000	355,000	..	100,000
	30,000,000	29,660,713	339,287	..
War services (South Africa and China) -	..	40,000,000	..	35,500,000
Special expenditure in connection with South Africa (including payment of compensation claims), China and Somaliland - - - - - - - -	4,500,000	..		
	34,500,000	69,660,713	..	35,160,713
Numbers.				
Vote A—				
Permanent Establishments - -	221,561	219,700	1,861	..
Temporary Establishments (due to war, &c.) - - - - - -	14,200	200,300	..	186,100
Total - - - - - -	235,761	420,000	..	184,239

		£
The close of the war in South Africa, while enabling a great reduction to be made in the Army Estimates, still leaves upon the Votes a sum of nearly 7,000,000*l.* in excess of the normal Army Services. Of the total of...		34,500,000
	£	
Compensation claims in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony absorb	2,000,000	
Extra cost of the increased garrison in South Africa, numbering nearly 30,000 in all, and maintained on a higher scale than peace footing	1,150,000	
Transport charges, temporary war pensions, &c. ...	850,000	
Charges in connection with the Somaliland Expeditionary Force and China, each 250,000*l.* ...	500,000	
	4,500,000	

	£	£
Beyond this the extra reserves of stores and clothing ordered in 1900 after the report of the Mowatt Committee require	2,157,000	
The Mowatt scheme (involving an expenditure of about 9,000,000*l.* on Estimates) will then be completed, with the exception of a balance of about 250,000*l.* to be provided in 1904–05.		
The Ordnance Factories, Vote amounts to	255,000	
	6,912,000	
The total due to normal services is thus reduced to		27,588,000

The reduction from War to Peace Establishments, although it has proceeded with great rapidity for the last 9 months, still leaves us, in consequence of the high recruiting figures of last year, with a surplus of men on the Home Establishment.

It has therefore been necessary to take a margin of 14,200 men pending the absorption of the surplus.

Although the Establishment of British troops remains approximately the same as last year, a reduction has been effected in the Establishment (both men and horses) of the Regular batteries allotted to Home defence. At the same time it is proposed to raise, in 1903–04, two additional brigade divisions of Militia Field Artillery, the cost of which will be met by reduction of surplus Militia Garrison Artillery. As regards the Colonial and native Indian corps there is a net increase of about 1,250. This is due to the inclusion of three Indian battalions, which it is found necessary to retain for the present in North China and Hong Kong. On the other hand there is a decrease arising from the disbandment of the 3rd Bn. West India Regiment and the reduction of the Chinese Regiment from eight to four companies.

The normal figure of the Estimates shows an increase of about 100,000*l.* over last year's figures, but large economies have been made enabling provision to be made for the following services :—

(*a.*) Manœuvres, for which an additional sum of 170,000*l.* is spread over various Votes.
(*b.*) Works, including a considerable addition to hospital and sanitary services.
(*c.*) Education, including Head-quarters Staff and additions at Sandhurst.
(*d.*) Increased provision for training of Auxiliary Force Officers.
(*e.*) Furnishing Officers' quarters and provision of Officers' chargers.
(*f.*) Increases to Intelligence, Medical, and Remount Departments, and improvements in Veterinary Department.

VOTE 1.—PAY, &C.

This Vote shows a gross decrease of 9,300,870*l.*, but an increase on normal services of 170,130*l.*, due to provision for the extra day in Leap Year, for certain additions to the Royal Engineers, Royal Army Medical Corps and Remount Department, for three more native battalions borrowed from the Indian Government for North China and Hong Kong, and for various minor increases.

VOTE 2.—MEDICAL SERVICES.

There is a gross decrease on this Vote of 495,000*l.*, but an increase on normal services of 25,000*l.*, due to provision for additions to the Medical and Nursing Services of the Army.

VOTE 3.—MILITIA.

This Vote shows a gross decrease of 474,000*l.*, but a normal increase of 46,000*l.* Provision has been made for the formation of two further brigade divisions of Militia Field Artillery, for additional companies of Militia Engineers and Militia Medical Corps, and for the training of a larger number of Infantry battalions than was possible in 1902. Improvements have also been made in the conditions of service of the Malta Militia and the Bermuda Artillery Militia.

APPENDIX I.

VOTE 4.—YEOMANRY.

The decrease of 105,000*l.* on this Vote is due to allowance having been made for the Yeomanry Force remaining below its full strength during 1903–04, it being unlikely that Establishments will be completely filled. On the other hand provision has been included for various concessions which have been pressed for by Yeomanry corps.

VOTE 5.—VOLUNTEERS.

The decrease of 7,000 on this Vote is due to the reduced provision required for Capitation Grants in consequence of the reduction in the number of efficients. On the other hand, new companies of the Army Medical Corps and brigade bearer companies have been provided for, and increased provision has been made for the instruction of Officers.

VOTE 6.—TRANSPORT AND REMOUNTS.

This Vote shows a gross decrease of 9,404,000*l.*, but a normal increase of 17,000*l.*, mainly due to provision for manœuvres.

VOTE 7.—PROVISIONS, FORAGE, &c.

There is a gross decrease on this Vote of 9,171,000*l.*, but an increase on normal services of 214,000*l.*, caused by the necessity of providing for manœuvres (as above mentioned), for systematic Mounted Infantry training at home, and for an increase in the number of effective soldiers in the Army.

VOTE 8.—CLOTHING, &c.

The gross decrease on this Vote amounts to 2,148,000*l.*, although increased provision for reserves of clothing under the Mowatt programme, amounting to 307,000*l.*, is included.

VOTE 9.—WARLIKE AND OTHER STORES.

The gross decrease on the Stores Vote is 3,509,455*l.*, but the normal decrease is 573,455*l.* only. This arises mainly on the items for guns, carriages and ammunition, and is due to the approved reserves of these stores having been practically completed.

VOTE 10.—WORKS, &c.

On the Works Vote there is a gross decrease of 266,293*l.*, despite a normal increase of 283,707*l.*, due to the continued growth of the charge for annuities in extinction of loans under the Military Works Acts and to necessary provision for new hospital and sanitary services.

VOTE 11.—EDUCATIONAL ESTABLISHMENTS.

The increase of 13,700*l.* is due mainly to additional staff and improvements at the Royal Military College, to the reconstitution of the Medical Staff College, and to an increase in the teaching staff of regimental and garrison schools.

VOTE 12.—MISCELLANEOUS.

There is a gross decrease of 41,890*l.* and a normal decrease of 1,890*l.* on this Vote. Additional subordinate staff has been provided for the Explosives Committee (for experimental services), but on the other hand a special payment voted in 1902–03, under "Rewards to Inventors," drops out.

VOTE 13.—WAR OFFICE.

The gross decrease on this Vote is 1,905*l.*, but there is a considerable increase on the normal Vote. This is due to a provision for strengthening the Intelligence Department, for which also further staff will probably be required according to the recommendations of a committee appointed in November last to consider the additional calls now falling on the Department. The appointment of a Director-General of Military Education and extra staff is also provided. There are also additions to the clerical establishment owing to the growth of work generally.

VOTES 14–16.—NON-EFFECTIVE SERVICES.

The gross decrease on the Non-Effective Votes is 150,000*l.*, but there is no variation in the total provision for normal services.

WAR OFFICE,
4th March, 1903.

ST. JOHN BRODRICK.

APPENDIX I.

ABSTRACT OF ARMY ESTIMATES, 1903–04 (ORDINARY SERVICES ONLY), COMPARED WITH CORRESPONDING FIGURES FOR 1902–03.

Votes.	1903–04.			1902–03.			Increase on Net Estimates	Decrease on Net Estimates
Nos.	Gross Estimate.	Appropriations-in-Aid.	Net Estimate.	Gross Estimate.	Appropriations-in-Aid.	Net Estimate.		
			Normal numbers.			Normal numbers.	Normal numbers.	Normal numbers.
A	—	—	221,561	—	—	219,700	1,861	—
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
1 Pay, etc.	10,123,000	1,045,000	9,078,000	10,104,870	1,197,000	8,907,870	170,130	—
2 Medical Services	452,000	2,000	450,000	426,800	1,800	425,000	25,000	—
3 Militia	919,000	12,000	907,000	876,600	15,600	861,000	46,000	—
4 Imperial Yeomanry	480,500	500	480,000	585,100	100	585,000	—	105,000
5 Volunteer Corps	1,282,000	2,000	1,280,000	1,288,600	1,600	1,287,000	—	7,000
6 Transport and Remounts	1,093,000	34,000	1,059,000	1,064,500	22,500	1,042,000	17,000	—
7 Provisions, etc.	4,250,800	60,800	4,190,000	4,022,500	46,500	3,976,000	214,000	—
8 Clothing	1,894,500	402,500	1,492,000	1,851,000	381,000	1,470,000	22,000	—
9 Stores	3,556,000	650,000	2,906,000	4,060,000	552,545	3,507,455	—	601,455
10 Works, etc.	1,957,800	137,800	1,820,000	1,658,963	122,670	1,536,293	283,707	—
11 Educational	207,700	73,200	134,500	192,910	72,110	120,800	13,700	—
12 Miscellaneous	70,400	8,400	62,000	71,645	7,755	63,890	—	1,890
13 War Office	301,750	250	301,500	273,655	250	273,405	28,095	—
Total Effective Services	26,588,450	2,428,450	24,160,000	26,477,143	2,421,430	24,055,713	104,287	—
14 Non-Effective Charges, Officers	1,964,941	406,941	1,558,000	1,930,051	389,051	1,541,000	17,000	—
15 Non-Effective Charges, Men	2,155,030	480,030	1,675,000	2,181,850	489,850	1,692,000	—	17,000
16 Civil Superannuation	195,068	68	195,000	195,068	68	195,000	—	—
Total Non-Effective Services	4,315,039	887,039	3,428,000	4,306,969	878,969	3,428,000	—	—
Total Effective and Non-Effective Services	30,903,489	3,315,489	27,588,000	30,784,112	3,300,399	27,483,713	104,287	—

ST. JOHN BRODRICK.

WAR OFFICE,
6th March, 1903.

APPENDIX II.

STATEMENT EXPLANATORY OF NAVY ESTIMATES, 1903–4.

The Estimates for 1903–4 amount to 34,457,000*l.*, as opposed to 31,255,000*l.* for the current year.

Administration.

The expansion and re-organisation of the Admiralty mentioned in my memorandum of last year is steadily proceeding on the principles therein laid down.

The question of the organisation of the Controller's Department was referred to a Committee presided over by Admiral Sir Charles Fane, K.C.B., the report of which was of great assistance to the Board. As the result, the Controller's Department as a whole has been strengthened; the Controller himself has received a Naval Assistant, and in that and other ways has been relieved of the burden of details, responsibility for which has been entrusted to his subordinates.

In the sphere of work of the Director of Naval Construction a new sub-branch has been formed under an officer, styled the Superintendent of Construction Accounts and Contract Work, whose position towards the Director of Naval Construction is analogous to that of the Superintendent of Naval Ordnance Stores to the Director of Naval Ordnance. The result is that while the Director of Naval Construction will be freer than he has ever been to devote his whole energies to the work of designing ships and of generally supervising their construction in accordance with his designs, the duty of the detailed superintendence of contract and financial work connected with construction will devolve on this new officer.

The Department of the Engineer-in-Chief has also been strengthened, and so better equipped to meet the constantly increasing strain upon it. The Engineer-in-Chief is not only the responsible adviser of the Board of Admiralty on all questions of Naval engineering, but he is also the official head of the engine-room branch of the personnel of the Navy. These two duties do not seem to me to be necessarily connected, and in view of the constantly increasing importance of what are really the functions of a Director of Naval Engineering the time will, in my opinion, come when it will be more convenient to separate them.

As already announced the Board have decided to strengthen their equipment for dealing with specially difficult problems of marine engineering by asking a small committee of the highest recognised authorities in the country to consent to meet on occasion, when summoned by the Controller, and give them the benefit of their advice on any question submitted to them.

The Naval Ordnance Store Department, re-organised as an integral sub-branch of the Naval Ordnance Department as mentioned in my last memorandum, has worked admirably during the past year. The policy of separation of Naval from Military ordnance stores is being steadily pursued. It has for some time been complete at the Home Ports; it was finally effected at Malta last year; it will be carried out this year at Bermuda; and it is under present consideration in relation to Hong Kong.

The representation of the Navy on the Ordnance Committee has been strengthened by the addition of an officer of the Royal Marine Artillery, and the Rear-Admiral Vice-President of the Ordnance Committee has become an Associate Member of the Explosives Committee.

The excellence of the organisation of the Transport Department of the Admiralty has been proved by the readiness with which that Department expanded itself to deal successfully with the vast calls made upon it in connection with the late war. As a result of the experience gained during the war the Department has been permanently strengthened and its organisation slightly modified.

The establishment of the Naval Intelligence Department has been permanently increased during the past year by the addition of two Naval officers of the Executive branch, one Marine officer, and a Civil Servant, and temporarily by the addition of one Naval officer of the Executive and another of the Engineer branch, and of another Marine officer. I have noticed some misconception in respect of this Department which I should like to correct; it seems to be a prevalent idea that either the Board of Admiralty or the Treasury have crippled it by refusing it the funds wherewith to expand, and frequent comparisons are drawn between the magnitude of the work which must fall to it and the size of its staff, and that of the staff of various foreign nations. I am glad of this opportunity of stating categorically that this conception of the attitude of the Treasury has no foundation in fact and that it is equally erroneous to suppose that the Board of Admiralty do not give their whole support to the Director of Naval Intelligence in his all-important task. The fact is that the Department is steadily expanding and will continue to expand, and it will have every assistance in its expansion which His Majesty's Government can give it; but I am not prepared to admit that the only measure of the value of the work of a department is the size of its staff, or that an exact comparison is possible between the staff of our Intelligence Department and that of a foreign nation.

As is well known, the organisation of the war mobilisation of the Fleet is part of the duty of the Naval Intelligence Department, and this work is being constantly revised; but the full scheme of the Board includes also the elaboration of the war organisation of the Admiralty itself, under the responsibility of the Secretary of the Admiralty, and aims at securing that each department of the Admiralty shall, at the same time as the Fleet is mobilised for war, be able to mobilise itself immediately for war administration, and that as little as possible shall be left for decision when war breaks out. Every department will expand automatically and know exactly how to carry on without referring to the Board for instructions.

The large programme of Works which it has been necessary to undertake to meet Naval requirements has involved a rapid increase in the Staff of the Works Department, and it has been difficult to obtain sufficient entries of competent Civil Engineers to keep it up to its proper strength. The conditions of entry and service have been investigated by a Committee, and on their recommendation certain changes are being made which should render the Works Department service sufficiently attractive to secure the entry by competitive examination of the best class of young men who are entering the Engineering profession.

Personnel.

In my statement of last year I recognised my special responsibility for devising a remedy for the future for the absence from the Flag List of a due proportion of younger officers, and the Board have already taken steps in this direction. At first sight the question appears a simple one; it is, however, one of the most complicated that can be conceived, because any change in any direction affects the career of such large numbers of officers and, unless fully thought out in advance, is liable to produce unexpected and undesired results. To assist them in elucidating this complicated problem the Board appointed a committee consisting of—

Viscount Goschen.
Admiral Sir Michael Culme Seymour, Bart., G.C.B.
Sir Francis Mowatt, G.C.B., Permanent Secretary of the Treasury.
Rear-Admiral E. S. Poë, M.V.O.
Captain Sir G. Warrender, Bart., R.N., C.B.
Sir Richard Awdry, K.C.B., Accountant-General of the Navy.

This Committee, to which and especially to its chairman, Lord Goschen, the Board are deeply indebted, have presented their report. As this report has only just been received, the Board have not yet had the opportunity of considering it, and I must reserve for a future occasion an examination of the question in detail.

I have again to emphasise in the strongest way the value of the war course at Greenwich for the senior officers of the Navy as conducted by the Captain of the College. The more the work of that course proceeds the more strongly emphasised is the necessity for its existence. It is not all officers who have turned their minds to the consideration of the many problems which will confront them in war, and the more this course stimulates the study of naval problems by officers of every rank the better it will be for the Navy.

APPENDIX II.

I have so recently laid before Parliament in a separate memorandum the new scheme of entry and training of naval officers that I have little at present to add to it, except to repeat what was stated in a foot-note that the Board are well aware that the age at which the medical and accountant officers of the Navy reach their relative rank requires readjustment. The Board have adopted it as a principle that the age at which the relative rank is attained by the different branches of the service should be more closely equalised, and the details are now being worked out. New and important regulations affecting the Medical Branch and the Naval Chaplains respectively, details of which will be found in the Appendix, have come into operation during the course of last year.

The new departure of sending the fourth term cadets to sea in the *Isis* has been an unqualified success. Not only has the time at sea been in no way detrimental to their studies, but the practical instruction has been such that they have been reported as already fitted to perform their duties as Midshipmen on joining the Fleet from the *Isis*.

The detailed plan for the future training of the men of the Navy is being steadily elaborated. It will be first of all introduced in the Portsmouth command, and will provide among other things that in the future an able seaman, before receiving his rating as such, must possess some mechanical knowledge and a fair knowledge of the simpler duties of the stokehold. On the same principles all obsolete instruction will be eliminated from the course on the boys' training ships and elementary instruction in the use of mechanical appliances substituted for it. Much more time will also be devoted than hitherto to the instruction of the boys in Gunnery. In the old days the physical training of the seamen was provided for in the best possible way by their work on the masts and yards. This is no longer the case, and it has been necessary to provide an adequate physical training by other means. Some particulars as to the gymnastic training which is being organised will be found in the Appendix.

The numbers voted for the current year were 122,500 officers and men, active service ratings. This establishment will undoubtedly have been fully reached by the end of the financial year, and for next year the numbers proposed are 127,100. The increase will consist of the following ranks and ratings:—

Officers	262
Warrant officers	95
Seamen	1,637
Artisans and electricians	95
Engine-room artificers	200
Stokers	1,830
Miscellaneous	411
Boys (Artificers, Shipwrights, &c.)	70
Total	4,600

In accordance with the recommendations of the Committee on Naval Reserves, presided over by Sir Edward Grey, it is proposed that 625 of the stokers and 375 of the seamen should be non-continuous service men. Legislation will be proposed to Parliament to enable the Board of Admiralty to make it a condition of enlistment for non-continuous service that after a limited period of service in the Fleet the men so enlisted should join the Royal Fleet Reserve for the unexpired portion of 12 years.

The Board owe a deep debt of gratitude to Sir Edward Grey and his colleagues for their work; the recommendations of the Committee will assuredly be of great value to the Board. I trust that as the result of the work of this Committee a principle and standard in respect of the manning of the Navy will be adopted by the Board which will receive the seal of the concurrence of Parliament; but, in view of the constant demands that are made in various quarters that additional ships should be placed in commission, I wish to lay stress on the fact that the number of the active service ratings must continue to increase disproportionately to the growth of the reserves unless a fairly constant ratio is observed between the ships in commission and the ships in reserve. On mobilisation for war each freshly-commissioned ship will receive a crew drawn partly from the active service ratings and partly from the reserves, in carefully approved proportions; but in time of peace a ship in commission can only be manned by active service ratings, the reserves—except for training in ships of the Home Fleet—not being available for this purpose. It consequently follows that at each additional commissioning in time of peace either the establishment of the active service ratings must be increased, or the number of active service ratings required to give the proper proportion to reserves will be deficient at the moment of mobilisation for war.

The *Calypso*, fitted as a drill ship, has been stationed at St. John's, and the Board are glad to be able to announce that with the assistance of the Colonial Government the Newfoundland branch of the Royal Naval Reserve is fairly started. It at present numbers some 180 men.

I have frequently expressed the views of the Board of Admiralty as to the overwhelming importance of proficiency in gunnery, and I am able to state positively that the whole of the Navy are striving, both officers and men, to reach the highest standard. It has recently been decided to award a medal (carrying with it a bonus), to be worn on the right breast, to the captains of the guns, seamen or marines, in each ship, who are judged by the Captain to be the best shot in that ship during the year with each nature of gun, conditionally on their attaining a minimum standard to be approved by the Admiralty. Gunnery is often spoken of as merely a question of money, but I entirely demur to this view. I do not believe that any amount of money prizes would stimulate the Fleet to as great exertions in this matter as their patriotism and sense of honour and duty are doing now. To make it a question of money is to lower the standard of duty, and in the end to deteriorate the proficiency of the ship for the purposes of war. The inevitable tendency of wholesale money prizes is to create an artificial atmosphere of competition as unlike as possible to the reality of war. Further, I must point out that the conditions under which different ships shoot differ so widely that there would be grave risk of injustice and of consequent discouragement if any attempt were made to single out one ship in the year as the best shooting ship in the Navy, or one man as the best shot in the Navy. On the other hand, it is quite possible to judge which man in each ship is the best shot with each nature of gun and to mark him out for honour accordingly as the Board have done. The fact is that excellence in gunnery is a question only of endeavour and of a sound system of training.

Construction and Reconstruction, and Repairs.

All the money voted for the year 1902–3 will have been earned and spent by the 31st March. The amount proposed in the Estimates for 1903–4 for New Construction is 10,137,000*l.*, of which 1,150,000*l.* will be devoted to the commencement of new ships. The corresponding amounts for the current year were 9,058,000*l.* and 700,000*l.* respectively. Since my last statement was presented to Parliament the Board have considered carefully the report of the Committee on the past arrears in shipbuilding; they believe that the light shed on the subject by that report has been of much value, and they have accordingly taken every opportunity of profiting by its recommendations. Between the 1st April 1902 and the 31st March 1903 inclusive the following ships will have been completed and passed into the Fleet Reserve:—

Battleships.—London, Venerable, Russell, Montagu.
First Class Armoured Cruisers.—Bacchante, Good Hope, Drake, Leviathan, King Alfred.
Sloops.—Odin, Merlin.
4 *Destroyers*, 3 *Torpedo Boats*, 6 *Submarines.*
Repair Ship.—Assistance.
Distilling Ship.—Aquarius.

On April 1st, 1903 there will be under construction:—

11 Battleships.
19 Armoured Cruisers.
2 Second Class Cruisers.
4 Third Class Cruisers.
4. Scouts.
2 Sloops.
19 Destroyers.
8 Torpedo Boats.
3 Submarines.

And it is expected that between the 1st April 1903 and the 31st March 1904 inclusive, the following ships will have been completed and passed into the Fleet Reserve :—

6 Battleships.
11 Armoured Cruisers.
1 Second Class Cruiser.
2 Sloops.
4 Destroyers.
8 Torpedo Boats.
3 Submarines.

It is proposed to commence during the financial year 1903–4 :—

3 Battleships.
4 First Class Armoured Cruisers.
3 Third Class Cruisers.
4 Scouts.
15 Destroyers.
10 Submarines.

It will also be necessary to build a new Admiralty Yacht, the old *Enchantress*, which has been going for nearly 40 years, being no longer seaworthy, another shallow-draft River Steamer for the China Station, and two vessels for Naval Reserve work.

Much progress will have been made by the 31st March next in the policy of reconstruction, announced in my statement of last year, as will be seen from the following list :—

Completed.—Battleships (Royal Sovereign Class).—Empress of India, Resolution, Revenge, Royal Oak.
First Class Cruiser.—Powerful.
Second Class Cruisers.—(Talbot Class).—Doris, Venus, Dido, Isis.
In hand.—Battleships.—Barfleur, Centurion.
First Class Cruiser.—Terrible.

Owing to the great pressure of work in the dockyards it has been decided to allow the contractors who are building the ships to complete them in all respects ready for commission, by which means all the shipbuilding firms who construct war vessels will gain further experience and be better prepared to undertake Naval work. The completion of these ships will entail an increase of the Controller's Naval Staff in order to ensure that the ships are fitted in every way in accordance with the usual custom of the service and to avoid any alterations or additions at the dockyards after final delivery.

The policy of relieving the congestion of repairs in the dockyards by sending ships to be repaired by the private firms which built them has been largely followed, and the Board propose to continue the policy which I am convinced is for the advantage of the Navy.

The subject of subsidised merchant cruisers has been brought to the front by the reports of the inter-departmental Committee, over which Lord Camperdown presided, and of the Committee of the House of Commons, of which Mr. Evelyn Cecil, M.P., was chairman, and by the creation of the great American shipping combination. Subsidised merchant cruisers can never be a subsitute for His Majesty's cruisers, but they will have their special uses. It did not seem to the Board right that any ship should be in existence which, in case of war, no ship at the disposal of the Board could reasonably expect to catch; and they were accordingly glad when, for this reason among others, His Majesty's Government decided, should Parliament approve, to give such a subsidy to the Cunard Company as will enable them to build two steamers of superior speed to anything afloat, which will be entirely at the disposal of the Admiralty in time of war. This, in the opinion of the Board, was definitely the most economical method of effectually meeting a special need. Before the current agreement in respect of subsidised merchant cruisers with the various steamship companies expires two years hence, the Board will have to reconsider their policy in respect of ships of no special speed in the light of the reports of the two Committees already mentioned.

Since my last statement the Boiler Committee have presented their final report on the questions referred to them, and I have announced that the policy of the Board, until further experience has been gained with the various types of water-tube boilers now being placed in His Majesty's ships, is to adhere to a combination of four-fifths water-tube of certain types recommended by the Committee, and one-fifth cylindrical boilers. I have never attempted to minimise the difficulties which have been caused to the Fleet by the adoption of Belleville boilers; these difficulties were due partly to the faulty manufacture of the first series of such boilers, partly to the great increase of pressure, and partly to the initial want of training of the *personnel* in their management, but they were mainly *ejusdem generis* with those which the Navy had for years to contend with on the first adoption of the various kinds of boilers which preceded them. As each of the earlier Belleville boiler ships comes in for refit on the termination of her commission she is being placed in thorough repair and made absolutely efficient for service. Owing to the experience gained no further difficulties ought to occur with these ships, and, although the Board agree with the Boiler Committee in considering other types of water-tube boilers to be much preferable, they also share the Committee's view that to replace these boilers by others in the ships which already have them would be an unjustifiable, because an unnecessary, expense.

I warned Parliament that the cost of repairs for the boilers of the earlier ships fitted with water-tube boilers would prove to be very heavy; but at the same time I pointed out that the history of the experience of the use of any new invention generally proceeded on similar lines, and that, in my opinion, the water-tube boiler had come to stay. Conflicting opinions on this subject are held so strongly that experience only can decide between them. On the one hand is arrayed the opinion of those who absolutely condemn the water-tube boiler, on the other hand the deliberate policy of every Naval Power, the report of our own recent Boiler Committee, and the opinion of every naval officer who is in command of a squadron which would have to act in war or who has the responsibility for decision at the Admiralty. If, as I believe will be the case, the offensive and defensive features of the new class of battleship now being designed, and of the *Duke of Edinburgh* class of armoured cruiser, give general satisfaction, it must be remembered that these results could not have been produced on anything like the displacement of these classes of ships but for the adoption of the water-tube type of boiler.

The Destroyer fitted with the turbine system of machinery, the *Velox*, alluded to in my last statement, is now going through her trials, and so has enabled the Board to resume their experiments.

The experiments with oil fuel referred to in both my last statements have been steadily prosecuted with constantly encouraging results, and two battleships of the Channel Squadron, the *Mars* and the *Hannibal*, and the new armoured cruiser *Bedford*, are now being fitted in respect of some of their boilers for a more extended trial, both with oil fuel alone and with oil fuel in combination with coal. The problem which the Navy has to solve in the use of oil fuel is a much more difficult one than that which the Mercantile Marine has had to solve, because oil fuel can be of no use to the Navy as compared with Welsh steam coal unless the combustion can be brought to such perfection as to render the fuel practically smokeless.

Distribution of the Fleet.

The proposals of the Board of Admiralty in respect of the Australian Squadron are contained in the papers which have been laid before Parliament in connection with the recent Colonial Conference, and I need not refer to them further here as those proposals have still to be discussed by the Parliaments of the Commonwealth and New Zealand.

It has been decided to sever the West Coast of Africa from the Cape Station, and to form a new Squadron to be called the South Atlantic Squadron, which will serve the South East Coast of America and the West Coast of Africa, and use Gibraltar and Sierra Leone as its bases.

The policy of changing the composition of the Home, Channel, and Mediterranean Squadrons of Battleships so that, like the China Squadron, they shall be composed of homogeneous classes of ships is steadily progressing, and will be continued in the coming year. Both the Mediterranean Fleet and the Channel Squadron have now two armoured cruisers apiece of the *Cressy* Class, and the Cruiser Squadron, which has lately been placed under the command of a Rear-Admiral, will shortly, I hope, be composed only of 23-knot vessels, viz., two of the *Drake* and four of the *Monmouth* class.

APPENDIX II.

Two additional Rear-Admirals have been appointed to the Mediterranean, one for service with the Cruiser Division of the Fleet and one as Senior Naval Officer at Gibraltar, the importance of which as a base is so greatly increased by the approaching completion of the moles and docks.

The Fleet in Home Waters has been re-organised and placed under the orders of a Vice-Admiral in Command, with a Rear-Admiral as Second in Command. His duties and responsibilities in respect of Home Waters are analogous to those of the Commander-in-Chief in the Mediterranean, except that they will in no way overlap or impinge upon the authority of the Commanders-in-Chief of the three Home Ports within their respective commands. The Home Fleet is quite independent of the Channel Squadron; it has as its nucleus of Battleships the Home Squadron, consisting of the former Port Guard ships, which have been withdrawn from this service; and it has its headquarters at Portland. This Squadron, in combination with the Coastguard Battleships and Cruisers, composes the Home Fleet, which assembles three times in each year for joint exercises.

Under the orders also when required of the Admiral Commanding the Home Fleet will be the several Destroyer Flotillas along the coast, which are now organised each under its own Captain and Commander, with a stationary parent ship and supervised by an Inspecting Captain of Destroyers, who is responsible for the general organisation of the whole. Sheerness Dockyard will be specially organised to undertake large refits and repair work for Destroyers and Torpedo Boats.

The Admiral Superintendent of Naval Reserves, whose duties will be largely increased in the future by the growth of the Reserves, will have separate and independent functions, and will no longer command a seagoing Squadron.

The increase of the Fleet in commission and reserve in Home Waters, and the consequent congestion of accommodation both for ships and men at the three Home Ports, led the late Board to appoint a Committee to enquire into the whole question. After full consideration of the report of this Committee, presented in January 1902, the Board came to the conclusion that the time had arrived for the creation of a fourth naval base and depôt in the United Kingdom. After an examination of all the available sites, and a thorough consideration of the question in its industrial and strategical aspects, necessarily extending over a good many months, the Board selected the Firth of Forth as fulfilling all the requirements of the Navy. Provisional negotiations have been proceeding for some weeks past, and proposals will be submitted to Parliament in the course of this Session for the acquisition of the land necessary to establish there a fourth Home Port.

I append the usual statement of the work done in the past year by the various departments of the Admiralty.

SELBORNE.

14*th February*, 1903.

STATEMENT OF WORK, 1902–3, &c.

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF FLEETS.

In the Mediterranean.

Three First Class Battleships, *Venerable*, *Repulse* (transferred from the Channel Squadron), and *Vengeance*, have been added to the Fleet.

The Battleship Squadron has been further reinforced in strength by the relief of *Royal Oak* and *Royal Sovereign* by *Bulwark* and *London* respectively—ships of more modern type. The *Canopus* is also shortly to be relieved by the *Russell*.

On the other hand the First Class Battleship *Hood* has been withdrawn without relief.

The Protected Cruisers, *Andromeda* and *Theseus*, have been replaced by the two Armoured Cruisers, *Bacchante* and *Aboukir*.

APPENDIX II.

The Second Class Cruisers, *Intrepid* and *Hermione*, have replaced the Third Class Cruiser *Barham* and the Coast Defence Ship *Rupert.*

There are now 28 Destroyers (of which 20 are kept in commission) on the Station as compared with 24 last year.

A stationary Depôt Ship for Torpedo Boat Destroyers on the Station, the *Orion*, has been commissioned with an Inspecting Captain in Command.

North America and West Indies Station.

The *Crescent* has been relieved as Flagship by the *Ariadne*, a vessel of more modern type.

The Third Class Cruiser *Psyche* has been replaced by the Second Class Cruiser *Retribution.*

Orders have been given for the *Urgent*, Depôt Ship at Jamaica, to be sold, and for the Naval establishment to be removed to the shore.

The Destroyers, *Quail* and *Rocket*, are to come home when convoy is available.

South-East Coast of America.

The *Basilisk*, Sloop, has been ordered home without relief.

Pacific.

Orders have been given for the *Liffey*, Store and depôt Ship at Coquimbo, to be sold and for the stores to be removed to Esquimalt.

Orders have also been given for the Torpedo Boat Destroyers, *Virago* and *Sparrowhawk*, to be transferred to the China Station.

Cape of Good Hope.

Monarch has been relegated to the position of Depôt Ship.

The Gunboats, *Thrush* and *Rattler*, have been relieved by the *Odin*, Sloop.

The shallow draught Gunboats, *Herald* and *Mosquito*, have been withdrawn from the Zambesi, their services there being no longer required.

East Indies.

The Turret Ships, *Abyssinia* and *Magdala*, have been transferred all standing to the Government of India. Of the other Indian Coast Defence Vessels, three Torpedo Boats will for the present be retained by the Indian Government ; of the remainder it has been arranged that the Gunboats *Plassy* and *Assaye* and four Torpedo Boats shall be turned over to the Admiralty from the Indian Government. The first of these is already in England, the *Assaye* has been ordered to return, and the four Torpedo Boats are at Aden, and are employed in the suppression of the arms traffic in the Gulf.

China.

Among other changes and withdrawals rendered possible by the termination of a critical period in China, the *Orlando* has been relieved by the more modern vessel *Amphitrite*, and of the ships lent temporarily to the China Station, the *Arethusa*, Second Class Cruiser, has been relieved by the *Thetis*, and is now on her way home, the *Astræa*, Second Class Cruiser, has been withdrawn without relief.

Channel Squadron.

The Protected Cruisers, *Diadem* and *Niobe*, have been relieved by the two Armoured Cruisers, *Hogue* and *Sutlej.*

The *Arrogant* has been relieved by the *Doris.*

The *Furious* is about to be paid off, her place being taken, by the *Hermes* which will join the Channel Squadron after undergoing trials.

Cruiser Squadron.

The First Class Cruiser *St. George* and the Second Class Cruiser *Juno* have been replaced by the Armoured Cruisers *Good Hope* and *Drake.* The Squadron will shortly be reinforced by the Third Class Cruisers *Medea* and *Medusa*, which at present are carrying out boiler trials under the direction of the Boiler Committee.

APPENDIX II.

Home Fleet, &c.

The *Dido*, *Venus*, and *Mersey* have relieved the *Galatea*, *Australia*, and *Severn* as Coast Guard Ships.

The *Æolus*, Second Class Cruiser, has replaced the *Empress of India* Battleship as Flagship at Queenstown.

Home Ports.

A Captain R.N. has been appointed for special service in connection with Torpedo Boat Destroyer Flotillas, and three Depôt Ships for Torpedo Boat Destroyers—the *Audacious* at Chatham, the *Warrior* at Portsmouth, and the *Triumph* at Devonport have been commissioned, to which the respective Instructional Destroyer Flotillas are attached as tenders.

The Battleships *Devastation* and *Dreadnought* have been appropriated to the Torpedo Schools at Portsmouth and Devonport for practice with submerged tubes.

At Portsmouth the *Hercules* will shortly replace the *Victory* as Flagship and Signal School, and at Devonport the *Téméraire* has been commissioned as Flagship and Fleet Reserve Depôt Ship.

The *Undaunted* has been commissioned as tender to the Gunnery School at Devonport.

The *Isis* has been commissioned as a seagoing tender to the *Britannia.*

The *Racer* has been sent to Portsmouth for service in connexion with the new Cadets Establishment at Osborne.

Manœuvres.

In July operations in the Channel were carried out by the combined Channel, Home and Cruiser Squadrons.

In September combined exercises and manœuvres were carried out in the Mediterranean by the ships of the Mediterranean, Channel, and Cruiser Squadrons.

PERSONNEL.

Steps have been taken to organise an improved system of physical training for the men and boys of the Fleet, the "masts and yards" training which has served the Navy so well in the past having become no longer available.

The details of the new exercises and methods of instruction to be employed under the new scheme have been carefully considered, and the revised handbook will shortly be issued to the Fleet.

With a view to superintending the work of instruction when the scheme is in full working order throughout the Fleet, it has been decided to create a staff of officers for this duty.

Early in the year a Commander R.N. was appointed as Superintendent of Gymnasia, and a Lieutenant R.N. and two Marine Officers were selected as Inspectors of Gymnasia. Arrangements have now been made for the appointment of 12 additional officers as Inspectors.

The new system of training demands also a considerable increase in the number of Instructors allowed to the Fleet. A new class of instructors has been formed with improved pay and position. Their training has been taken in hand and a small number already drafted to the Channel and Mediterranean Squadrons.

A limited number of staff appointments have also been created, open to the best qualified Instructors.

The organisation of the Engineers' Training College at Keyham, which, in future, is to be styled the Royal Naval Engineering College, has been under consideration, the object of the Board being to improve the general training and education of Engineer Cadets as Naval Officers.

A Captain in lieu of a Commander has been appointed to superintend the College, and a staff of Engineer Officers has been associated with him in connexion with the training of the Engineer Cadets throughout their professional and technical instruction, both in the College and in the Dockyard Workshops, following the principle established in the Britannia College at Dartmouth.

Several small improvements tending to increase the comfort and well-being of the students will be carried out at the same time.

Sanction has been obtained for a reduction of the age and qualifying service for promotion to Artificer Engineer.

Amended regulations for the entry of surgeons have been published. The chief alterations are the improved scale of pay for medical officers, charge pay for Inspectors-General in charge of Hospitals, and also of medical officers in charge of hospital ships, rearrangement of the subjects of examination both for entry and for promotion, increased powers of admitting candidates by nomination of medical schools, colonial universities, &c., earlier promotion to those who have held appointments of house surgeons, and the payment of the fees of medical officers for civil hospital courses. The number of candidates at the competitive examination has improved since the new regulations have been in force, and the number of medical officers now on the active list is greater than at any time during the last quarter of a century.

A consultative board of eminent medical men has been formed, with the Medical Director-General as president, to decide on the best method of dealing with special questions appertaining to the Medical Department.

Amended regulations for the employment of temporary surgeons in case of war or emergency, by which the pay has been materially raised and an equipment allowance granted, have attracted a satisfactory number of candidates.

A course of training has been instituted at Plymouth Hospital for sick berth staff probationers, and a course of training in massage at Haslar, with extra pay for those qualified on appointment to a hospital.

Revised medicine chests, new Field Service valise, emergency surgical dressings, Röntgen ray apparatus to ships as well as shore establishments, new metal aseptic operation tables, microscopes and bacteriological outfits to H.M. Ships have been supplied, and the trial of various forms of stretchers on board ship have been, and are being carried out.

Steps are being taken to provide an auxiliary sick berth staff from volunteers of the St. John Ambulance Brigade and the St. Andrew's Ambulance Association Corps of Scotland.

In order that the Chaplains of the Navy may be granted a licence which will be recognised by all Bishops and other authorities of the Church of England and churches in communion with her throughout the world, they have been placed under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Admiralty retaining in full their authority over them as officers of the Royal Navy. The Chaplain of the Fleet has also been granted the ecclesiastical dignity of Archdeacon under the Archbishop of Canterbury, with whom he has been placed in official relations in respect of the spiritual welfare of members of the Church of England serving in the Royal Navy or Royal Marines.

THE ROYAL MARINES.

As a result of the new recruiting order that in the case of recruits for the Royal Marines a searching inquiry is to be made into the candidate's antecedents, similar to that required for the Royal Navy, the Corps has been able to maintain its full establishment, while at the same time the wastage has been materially reduced.

An increase of pay amounting to 2*d.* a day has been granted to all warrant officers, non-commissioned officers, and men of the Corps, in consequence of the similar advantage accorded to the Army.

During the year 6,196 Marines have passed the course of Musketry afloat under Navrl conditions, about 10 per cent. qualifying as marksmen. 3,851 trained Marines have been exercised on shore under the Army Regulations, of whom about 20 per cent. qualified as marksmen, and 2,131 recruits were trained for the first time.

Sanction has been obtained for the appointment of two Assistant Marine Intelligence Officers for the Mediterranean, one at Malta and one at Gibraltar, with authority to pay allowances to similar officers when employed on other Stations.

NAVAL RESERVES.

In addition to the six Signal Stations already fitted with Wireless Telegraphy apparatus, eight others will probably be so fitted during the coming financial year. It is proposed to establish nine additional ones later on.

APPENDIX II.

It is proposed to increase the personnel of the Coast Guard from 4,200 to 4,500, the number voted 20 years ago, but for the coming financial year only 4,237 will be required. This increase is necessary to provide crews for new Signal Stations which are to be kept manned in peace time, and for wireless telegraphy work.

The number of Executive officers, R.N.R., now undergoing naval training in H.M. ships are—

	Lieuts.	Sub-Lieuts.	Mids.	Total.
12 months' training ...	20	30	18	68
G. and T. Courses ...	4	16	10	30

Two hundred and seventy-six officers on the Active List have already undergone this training, and are in receipt of training fees.

The Establishment of Engineers, R.N.R., 400 of all ranks, is complete, viz :—

Senior Engineers	74
Engineers	196
Assistant Engineers	130
	400

There are 80 qualified candidates on the list of applicants for appointment.

The following officers have completed or are now undergoing instructional courses at the Dockyards :—

Senior Engineers	23
Engineers	68
Assistant Engineers	15
	106

Seamen, R.N.R.

The numbers borne on 31st December as compared with those voted for 1902–3, and former years, are :—

Class.	Voted.	Borne.		
	1902–3.	31.12.02.	31.12.01.	31.12.00.
Qualified Seamen	11,000	4,298	3,485	2,937
1st class (Old System)		6,472	7,106	7,978
Seamen	11,000	5,572	4,973	4,218
2nd class (Old System)		4,273	5,063	5,996
Totals	22,000	20,615	20,627	21,129

This shows that the total number of Seaman ratings is approximately the same as it was a year ago.

1,207 Qualified Seamen and Seamen have been embarked in H.M. Ships for Naval training during the year 1902, as against 827 in the preceding year. 605 were similarly embarked in January, 1903.

The Firemen have steadily increased, the numbers borne being—

On 31st December, 1902	4,033
,, ,, 1901	3,714
,, ,, 1900	3,530

The process of re-arming the drill ships and batteries is being continued.

The *Gannet* is nearly ready to replace *President* in the West India Docks. The *Satellite* is to replace the *Clyde* at Aberdeen, and a stationary drill ship is to be provided for Kingstown.

It is also proposed to add to the number of R.N.R. Batteries in Scotland.

APPENDIX II.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL.

Landed Estates.—Extensive improvements have been effected in the sanitary condition of the house property at Greenwich, and a new roof has been erected over the market.

The dwellings of the workmen employed at the colliery at Scremerston have been enlarged, the water supply improved, and much-needed sanitary arrangements carried out.

Benefits of Greenwich Hospital.—Sanction has been obtained for the grant of pensions and allowances to the widows and children of seamen and marines who may die from accident or disease attributable to the Service within two years of being certified to be ill, instead of 12 months.

Greenwich Hospital School.—The number of boys who left the School during the year was about the average; but the percentage of boys who entered His Majesty's Service was 75·79, the highest proportion on record.

ORDNANCE.

During the Financial Year 1902–3 progress in gun manufacture and supply has been satisfactory. All requirements for re-armaments and for new construction have been fully met.

The re-armament of certain Battleships and Cruisers announced last year has made good progress.

The replacement of powder cartridges by Cordite for B.L. guns, and in some directions the substitution of Cordite M.D. for Service Cordite, has made good progress during the past year. Practically speaking, the effective War Fleet may now be said to be provided with Cordite.

Proposals for bringing up to date the armament of Royal Naval Reserve Drill Ships and Batteries are now taking effect, and provision is made for continuous progress towards the completion of this service.

Steady improvement in defensive armour of modern ships imperatively demands higher ballistics in our guns, and this important and urgent question has been prominently before the Ordnance and Explosive Committees.

Investigations and experiments have been continuously directed towards the development of the most suitable propellant, the possibility of reconstructing and raising the power of some of the earlier marks of guns which still form part of our armaments, the construction of guns specially designed to give higher velocities under conditions of increased pressures, and the utilisation of nickel steel in gun manufacture.

A new Naval Ordnance Depôt at Lodge Hill, in the Chatham District, is approaching completion. It is already partly in use, and it is expected that it will be fully occupied before the end of 1903. This will not only meet the demands of the Chatham District, but also tend to diminish the great concentration of munitions of war at Woolwich.

Since the last annual statement experiments with "capped" projectiles have been steadily progressing, in continuation of those made previously. The results have, so far, demonstrated the desirability of acting with caution as to the general adoption of this invention, in view of its merit being dependent to a considerable degree upon the ballistics of the gun from which the projectile is fired and the ranges at which it is more effective than others.

COALING OF THE FLEET.

Progress is being made with the improvements in coaling facilities provided for in the Naval Works Act, 1901, particularly at the more important places.

A contract has been made for the supply of a large floating depôt with rapid working transporters for use at a Home Port, and the provision of other depôts of a similar description is in contemplation.

Some of the additional coaling craft fitted with modern appliances have been delivered, and provision for further craft is included in the Estimates for 1903–4.

Before coming to any decision in regard to adopting an apparatus for coaling His Majesty's Ships at sea, further trials of various schemes are in contemplation, which it is hoped will be carried out during 1903–4.

The reserve stocks of patent fuel at home and abroad have been added to during the year, and provision is made in the Estimates for 1903–4 for further additions.

Provision is also made in the Estimates for 1903–4 for craft for storing oil fuel for supply to ships and Torpedo Boat Destroyers whose furnaces have been fitted for using this description of fuel.

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

The Vote for New Construction during 1902–3 is greater than in any preceding year. The work generally on the ships in hand has made good progress.

In order that the First Class Cruisers included in last year's programme might have the best features embodied in their designs it was necessary towards the close of the year to introduce several changes which led to a delay in placing the Contracts for these vessels.

It has been arranged during the year that the vessels in course of construction at the Contractors' premises shall be completed by the Contractors in all respects ready for immediately passing into the Fleet Reserve on delivery instead of, as heretofore, leaving the carrying out of the trials, installation of the armament, and completion of certain details till after delivery at one of His Majesty's Dockyards. It is anticipated that this new policy will result in economy of time and money, and will relieve the Dockyards from a certain amount of work which can more profitably be devoted to the efficient maintenance of the Fleet. Some of the vessels to be delivered by the Contractors during the next financial year will be delivered in a completed condition under this new arrangement. The first of the new vessels to be so delivered is the *Donegal*, building at the Fairfield Shipbuilding Company. She will be followed very shortly by the *Lancaster*, building at Elswick.

Battleships.

The trials of the *London*, *Venerable* and *Russell*, as well as those of the *Duncan* and *Exmouth*, were carried out with successful results. The speeds obtained on trial were slightly in excess of the estimated speeds as designed. The *Montagu's* trials are not yet complete.

Armoured Cruisers.

The trials of the new vessels of the *Drake* class have been carried out with successful results. The speeds obtained on trial were in all cases somewhat in excess of the estimated speeds as designed. Moreover analyses of trials showed that although the speeds were already in excess of the designed speeds, it was highly probable that by fitting new propellers still further increases of speed might be obtained. New experimental propellers were accordingly fitted to *Drake*, with the result that the speed actually reached was slightly more than a knot in excess of the estimated design speed of 23 knots. Arrangements are being made to fit similar new propellers to the other vessels of the class.

The trials of the *Bedford* and *Kent* of the county class have been carried out, but the estimated speed was not obtained; it is, however, anticipated that new propellers will overcome the deficiency. The *Monmouth*, a similar vessel, is now under trial with experimental propellers.

The new Armoured Cruisers of the present year's programme, viz.: *Duke of Edinburgh* and *Black Prince*, are somewhat smaller than *Drake* class, being 13,550 tons displacement as against 14,100 tons in the case of *Drake* class. The estimated speed is $22\frac{1}{3}$ knots, in comparison with the estimated speed of 23 knots in the case of *Drake* class; but the armament of the new vessels is more powerful than that of *Drake* class, and the armour defence is more effective. They should be completed in 1905–06.

Protected Cruisers.

On the commencement of the next financial year there will be under construction six vessels of this type, viz.:—

Challenger	Second Class
Encounter	
Diamond	Third Class
Sapphire	
Amethyst	
Topaze	

Challenger will be passed into the Fleet Reserve during 1903–4, and the other five vessels, it is anticipated, will join the Fleet Reserve during 1904–05.

The two vessels of this type taken in hand this year, viz :—

Diamond,
Sapphire,

are sister vessels to *Amethyst* and *Topaze*.

Scouts.

Four vessels of an entirely new class known as "Scouts," have been ordered during the year, by contract. These vessels are named :—

Adventure,
Forward,
Pathfinder,
Sentinel,

and are building at Elswick, Fairfield, Laird's, and Vickers, respectively.

It is expected that these four vessels will be passed into the Fleet Reserve in 1904-5.

These vessels are to maintain a speed of 25 knots for eight hours continuous steaming when in ordinary seagoing condition.

The coal supply is to be sufficient for a radius of action of not less than 3,000 knots at 10 knots speed.

Designs for these vessels were furnished by the respective builders, but considerable time has been taken up in the preparation, examination and modification of the various designs received.

Sloops.

At the commencement of the present financial year there were four vessels of this type, viz. :—

Odin,
Merlin,
Cadmus,
Clio,

under course of construction. The *Fantome* and *Odin* have already been commissioned and are now on their stations.

The *Merlin* will be passed into the Fleet Reserve during the present year. *Cadmus* and *Clio* will be passed into the Fleet Reserve during 1903–4.

Torpedo Boat Destroyers.

During the year the *Arab* and *Express* have been commissioned. Two others, viz. : *Lively* and *Success*, have been passed in the Fleet Reserve. These four vessels are the last of those ordered prior to 1901–2.

On the commencement of the next financial year there will be 19 under construction. Four of these, viz., *Velox*, *Ribble*, *Derwent*, and *Erne*, will, if no delay occurs on the trials, be passed into the Fleet Reserve in 1903–4. The remainder will join the Fleet Reserve in 1904–5.

Eight of the nine Torpedo Boat Destroyers added to the programme during the present financial year are practically repeats of the latest preceding Torpedo Boat Destroyers. The remaining one, the *Velox*, has been purchased.

Torpedo Boats.

At the commencement of the year there were seven Torpedo Boats under construction, viz. Nos. 107 to 113 inclusive. Three of these, viz. 107, 108, 109, will have been completed during the present year.

At the commencement of the next financial year there will be eight Torpedo Boats under construction, viz. 110 to 117, both inclusive, all of which are due to be passed into the Fleet Reserve during 1903–4.

Submarines.

At the commencement of the year there were five vessels of the *Holland* type under construction, viz. Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, and they have all been delivered. Progressive trials will shortly commence to test their practical utility both for defence and attack.

APPENDIX II.

Four vessels of an improved type, called the "A" Class, have been laid down, and it is hoped they will be completed during 1903–4. They will be distinguished as A 1 A 2, A 3, and A 4. Preliminary trials with A 1 have been carried out.

Armour.

Several trials have been made during the year to ascertain that the qualities of supplies from the armour-plate makers were equal to the contract conditions. In all cases the quality of the supplies was very satisfactory.

MACHINERY AND BOILERS.

Two more Torpedo Gunboats, the *Leda* and *Halcyon*, are being re-engined and re-boilered with small tube water-tube boilers, associated with light quick-running engines, in addition to the *Niger*, *Gossamer*, *Jason*, and *Circe*.

The *Niger* and *Gossamer* have successfully completed their trials. and the *Jason* and *Circe* are well advanced.

New water-tube boilers have been fitted in six First Class Torpedo Boats, and new boilers have been delivered for six other First Class Boats and are being fitted on board.

New water-tube boilers are being made for ten more First Class Torpedo Boats, while arrangements are also being made to obtain new water-tube boilers for thirteen other boats.

During the last year it has been decided to adopt a combination of one-fifth cylindrical and four-fifths water-tube boilers in the six armoured Crusiers of the *Devonshire* class of the 1901–02 programme, and also in the Battleships and First Class Cruisers of the 1902–03 programme, the four various types of water-tube boilers adopted being recommended by the Boiler Committee.

The cylindrical boilers of half the ships are fitted with closed stokeholds, and of the others with closed ashpit and heated air supply.

The Yarrow boilers of the *Hampshire* are fitted with closed stokehold draught, and those of the *Antrim* with closed ashpits and heated air supply.

The automatic forced lubricating arrangements fitted for main engines in *Syren*, Torpedo Boat Destroyer, have worked satisfactorily.

Turbine Propelling Machinery.

The *Velox*, fitted with turbine machinery, and also with small reciprocating engines for use at low speeds, has been purchased and is now undergoing her trials.

Also one of the two Third Class Cruisers (the *Amethyst*) and one of the Destroyers ordered last year are being fitted with turbine propelling machinery, but with small auxiliary turbines for use when cruising at low powers, instead of reciprocating engines. On the completion of trials of the above vessels information will be obtained as regards the more extended use of this system.

Water-tube Boiler Tests on Re-boilered Ships.

H.M.S. *Hermes*, under repair at Messrs. Harland & Wolff's, has been fitted with Babcock and Wilcox boilers, and the machinery trials for acceptance will shortly take place, prior to the vessel being handed over for a series of trials under the direction of the Boiler Committee, similar to those lately carried out in the *Hyacinth*.

The *Medea* and *Medusa* have been re-boilered with Yarrow (large tube) and Dürr types of water-tube boilers, respectively, under the supervision of the Boiler Committee, and each ship has made a series of preliminary trials, but at which no complete records were taken, and the remaining series of trials will shortly take place.

Standardization.

During the past year the question of making the machinery of war vessels interchangeable has received much attention, and a considerable advance in this matter has been made.

It has now been definitely arranged that practically all the auxiliary machinery in all new vessels of each class ordered at the same time is to be identical and interchangeable, and if practicable, and subject to any desirable improvements, they are made interchangeable with those of previous orders.

APPENDIX II.

Reserve.

It has been decided to have a reserve of auxiliary machinery to enable repairs to be carried out more expeditiously, and this will gradually be developed, and together with the standardization of certain parts of the main machinery, it is anticipated that repairs in peace time will be more quickly carried out, and in war time this interchangeability may prove to be of incalculable value.

LARGE REPAIRS AT THE HOME DOCKYARDS AND BY CONTRACT.

The following ships have been or will be completed :—

By Dockyards.

Alexandra.
Barrosa.
Empress of India.
Europa.
Gannet.
Hood.
Northampton.
Porpoise.
Powerful.
Resolution.
Revenge.
Royal Oak.
Thetis.
Thunderer.
Undaunted.

By Contract.

Aurora.
Diadem.
**Gossamer.*
Hermes.
Medea.
Medusa.
**Niger.*
Pelorus.

The following are now in hand, or their refit will have been commenced during 1902–3 :—

By Dockyards.

Arrogant.
Audacious.
Barfleur.
Bonaventure.
Centurion.
Invincible.
Juno.
Leander.
Philomel.
Rodney.
Tartar.
Theseus.

By Contract.

Circe.
Colossus.
Halcyon.
Hecla.
Howe.
Jason.
Leda.
Niobe.
Psyche.
Spitfire.
Terrible.

The details of the repairs and refits proposed to be carried out in 1903–4 appear in the Appendix to the Navy Estimates, but the principal refits to be commenced in 1903–4 are given below :—

By Dockyards.

Andromeda.
Cæsar.
Furious.
Magnificent.
Majestic.
Minerva.
Nile.
Proserpine.
Ramillies.
Repulse.
Royal Sovereign.
Trafalgar.
Victorious.

By Contract.

Argonaut.
Astrea.
Canopus.
Crescent.
Endymion.
Goliath,
Highflyer.
Magpie.
St. George.

---

* These vessels were re-engined and re-boilered by contract, the hull work having been completed in the Dockyard.

APPENDIX II.

NEW WORKS.

WORKS PROVIDED IN ESTIMATES.

Chatham.—The new Receiving Shed for Stores and New Gun Mounting Store will be completed, and considerable progress will be made with the new Slaughter House during 1903–4.

Sheerness.—The new Fitting Shop will be practically finished by the end of March, 1904. The extension of Rifle Range will be finished in 1902–3.

Portsmouth.—The erection of the new Steam Factory is being proceeded with as rapidly as possible. The work of lengthening No. 12 Dock is nearly completed. Good progress is being made with the extension of No. 13 Dock.

Devonport.—The new Building Slip is completed and the shops will be practically finished during 1902–3.

Gibraltar.—The new Cold Meat Store for the joint use of Army and Navy will be completed in 1903–4.

Malta.—The new Rifle Range will be completed in 1903–4, during which year considerable progress will be made with the new Torpedo Range.

Singapore.—The work of providing Naval Ordnance Store accommodation, the cost of which is jointly borne by Army and Navy, is progressing towards completion.

Dredging.—Good progress is being made at Malta with rock-dredging in French Creek, and a large quantity of mud has been removed from Sliema Creek. At Bermuda the berth for the new Floating Dock has been completed.

Coaling Depôts.—The work at Falkland Islands will be practically completed by the end of 1902–3. The new Coal Store and widening of Jetty at Esquimalt are almost finished.

Hospitals.—The new General Hospital at Portland and the additional accommodation at Hong Kong are expected to be completed in 1903–4. The new Hospital Blocks at Malta will be practically completed in 1902–3.

The principal new Works for 1903–4 are :—

Osborne.—Accommodation for Naval Cadets.

Keyham.—Additions and alterations at Royal Naval Engineering College.

Portland.—Canteen.

Gibraltar.—Additional distilled water tank.

Malta.—Renewing wharf walls in Dockyard Creek. Adaptation of War Department property for Victualling purposes. Renewal of buildings in connexion with Hydraulic Dock. New Theatre at Canteen.

Jamaica.—Official Residences.

Sydney.—New Prison on Garden Island.

Cape of Good Hope.—General Hospital and Sanatorium.

Wei-hai-wei.—Hospital accommodation.

PROGRESS UNDER NAVAL WORKS LOAN ACTS.

Enclosure and Defence of Harbours.

Gibraltar.—Admiralty Mole Extension.—The Mole is being increased to its full section. Of the Quay Wall on the harbour side of the Mole a length of 2,809 feet is finished and coped. The whole of the blockwork of the wall is complete.

The Roundhead at the end of the Mole is in hand.

Detached Mole.—Of the superstructure on the harbour side a length of 2,322 feet is complete with coping, and on the sea side 2,263 feet of parapet is complete.

The deepening of the harbour by dredging is making good progress, and a large portion has been finally sounded and taken over from the contractors.

Commercial Mole.—The waterport reclamation with Wharf Wall has been completed. A portion of the new wharf has been opened for traffic.

Northern Arm, outer slope.—A length of about 1,500 feet is pitched.

Portland.—About 48,300 superficial yards of facing have been executed, and a length of about 4,620 feet of the breakwater is completed, except partial filling in of joints.

Dover.—Admiralty Pier Extension.—The staging is complete for a total distance of 1,628 feet from the outer end of the original Admiralty Pier.

Good progress has been made with the block-setting, the foundation course having been laid for a total length of 1,370 feet.

Fair progress has also been made with the Turret Widening Wall, and the foundations are now closed up to its junction with the Admiralty Pier extension.

East Reclamation.—This work is now practically complete, with the exception of the coping, which has been set for a total length of 3,400 feet.

East Arm and Root Wall.—The staging is completed to a distance of 2,150 feet from the junction of the East Arm with the Reclamation Wall.

Good progress has also been made with the block-setting, the foundation course being laid for a total length of 1,835 feet, the low-water course for 1,635 feet, and the work complete to formation level for 1,560 feet.

Malta Breakwater.—Necessary land has been acquired, and a contract let for the construction of Ricasoli and St. Elmo Breakwaters.

Adapting Naval Ports, &c.

Keyham Dockyard Extension.—Graving Dock No. 5.—Practically finished with the exception of the north and south ends of the East Wall and the Caisson Cambers, which have been built to within 15 feet of coping level.

Graving Dock No. 6.—The floor is nearly finished. The East Wall and Caisson Cambers have been built to a level of 38 feet below coping. The West Wall, with the exception of the north end, has reached the level of 13 feet below coping.

Entrance Lock.—The floor has been completed. The East Wall for a length of 400 feet has been built to level of 36 feet below coping, and for the remaining length to level of 46 feet below coping. In the South Camber the floor is completed.

Closed Basin.—About 950,000 cubic yards of mud have been excavated and removed to sea.

Tidal Basin.—Five concrete columns have been sunk for the foundation of head of North Arm of Entrance. Excavation over the site is in progress.

Outer Wall.—At the south end, for a length of 1,000 feet, the wall is practically complete, and for a length of 300 feet south and 450 feet north of the Entrance to Closed Basin the upper portion of the wall is in progress, and also for a length of 600 feet at north end.

Pumping Station.—The building is practically completed; the boilers are all fixed in place in the boiler house, and the machinery is in course of erection.

Gibraltar Dockyard Extension.—The Reclamation continues to make good progress. Part of Chief Constructor's building has been taken over from Contractors, and is now occupied by Dockyard; machine foundations put in and machines fixed.

Stores.—East Wall complete. Piling, concrete foundations, and footings to all walls completed. All constructional steel work in South-East compartment finished, and in progress in other compartments.

Permanent Hauling Engine House.—Complete and in use as a Store by Dockyard.

Torpedo Stores.—All walls built.

Pumping Engine House.—All walling and roofing completed. Boiler-room and coal-store floors laid. Tank completed.

Underground Water Tanks.—Nos. 3 and 4 tanks completed and in use.

The Dams for all the three Docks are completed and the enclosed areas pumped dry. Excavation for Docks 1 and 2 is in progress, and work on No. 3 Dock is in a forward state, the walls being nearly up to coping level and pumping arrangements practically completed.

Six of the Slipways are completed.

Construction of the Boat House is in forward state.

Malta Dockyard Extension.—The work of preparing sites is well advanced. Many of the subsidiary works are completed. Progress is being made on the two docks which are being built by contract; but the work has been considerably retarded by difficulties due to the infiltration of sea water.

Bermuda Dockyard Extension.—The dredging is practically completed. The work of block-making, depositing rubble mound and mass concrete under the contract is progressing.

The New Floating Dock has arrived safely at Bermuda.

Hong Kong.—The Reclamation in front of the Naval Yard and War Department Properties is in hand. The Dam for enclosing the Dock is approaching completion. The North Wharf Wall and the Murray Pier Extension are in progress. The diversion of the Albany Nullah is being proceeded with.

Simon's Bay Dockyard Extension.—A commencement has been made on the rubble embankments.

Deepening Harbours and Approaches.—At Portsmouth the approach channel has been dredged as far as possible. In the inner harbour 10 berths have been finished and three others well advanced.

At Devonport, in the work in progress above Saltash Bridge, 12 more berths are almost completed, in addition to the 13 dredged last year.

Colombo Dock.—This work is in progress under the Colonial Government.

Chatham Dock. — Although serious difficulties have been met with in the execution of this work, more than three parts of it have been done, and it will probably be completed during 1903–4.

Coaling Facilities.—Gibraltar.—A tender for the construction of the Coal Island has been accepted, and the order given to commence the work. The railway from Waterport to the Island is in progress.

Kowloon.—The Briquette Factory site has been acquired and instructions given as to levelling the site, repairing Wharf Walls, &c., as necessary. Plot 36, adjoining the Briquette Factory site, has also been purchased.

A contract has been made for a large Floating Depôt for use at a Home Port.

A considerable amount of property has been acquired at Malta and Hong Kong for the storage of coal.

A jetty is being constructed at Haulbowline.

A contract is about to be made for the extension of the present coaling jetty at Portland.

Naval Barracks, &c.

Chatham Naval Barracks.—The buildings comprised in the First Contract, viz:—The Seamen's Quarters, Officers' Quarters and Mess Establishment, Depôt Offices, Drill Shed and Stores, and the Canteen, together with the Retaining Wall and all Drains and Water Mains, Grounds, Footpaths, Roads and Courtyards to the South of the Retaining Wall, were taken over from the Contractors on the 26th March 1902.

The North and Lower East Roads and Footpaths and the Drains and Water Mains in same were taken over from the Contractors on the 11th December 1902.

The buildings in the Second Contract, viz:—Guard House with Main Entrance Gates, Cells, and Post Office, the Warrant Officers' Mess and the Swimming Bath with Bowling Alley, together with all Roads, Drains, Water Mains, and Grounds thereto, were taken over from the Contractors on the 11th December 1902.

It is anticipated that the Barracks will be ready for occupation by 1st April 1903.

Portsmouth Naval Barracks.—Officers' Quarters and Mess are roofed in and walls plastered.

Men's blocks are completed, except flooring.

The Subsidiary Buildings are completed, except fittings.

The Guard House is completed, except painting, and the additional Cells are in progress.

The formation of parades is in progress, and the Boundary Walls and Main Gate are completed.

The Depôt Offices are roofed in and partially slated. The Electric Lighting of the Barracks generally is well advanced.

Keyham Naval Barracks.—The buildings included in the first Contract, *i.e.*, two Men's Blocks, and the Officers' Mess and Quarters, were taken over from the Contractors on 17th March 1902, and are now occupied.

The buildings included in the Second Contract are in progress, the extension of the Bowling Alley being well advanced, and the concrete foundations of the Provost Establishment are being laid.

The Sick Quarters are completed and were taken over from the Contractors on the 12th December 1902.

Chatham Naval Hospital.—In Pavilions F 1 to F 6 work is well advanced.

The internal Fittings of the Pavilions are in progress and the connecting corridors have been roofed in.

The Administrative Block is completed, with the exception of internal decoration and fittings, and the constructional work in the Infectious Blocks and all subsidiary buildings is practically complete.

The Principal Medical Officer's and Fleet Surgeon's Residences are nearing completion.

The Chaplain's Residence and Sisters' Quarters are roofed in and slated.

The Police Lodge is nearly completed.

Dartmouth.—" Britannia " R.N. College.—The Sick Quarters are completed. Good progress is being made with the main buildings, which are expected to be finished by November 1904. This will admit of their occupation by Easter Term 1905.

Magazines.—At Chatham the Chattenden Magazine has been taken over for use. Quarters for Police and Workmen have been completed, and arrangements are being made for the construction of Railway from Chattenden to Teapot Hard.

The work at Priddy's Hard and Bull Point is practically completed.

A new Laboratory is being built.

Gibraltar.—A tender has been accepted for the new Magazines, at the back of the Ragged Staff. The work is to be completed in 2½ years' time.

February 14, 1903. S.

APPENDIX III.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CXIX.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the Lords.

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Bank Holidays (Ireland)	*Earl of Dunraven*	Read 1ª 12th March (525) Read 2ª 17th March (986) Committee Report } 20th March (1375) Read 3ª and passed 23rd March (1434)
*Electric Lighting (London) [H.L.]	*Lord Wolverton*	Read 2ª 19th March (1211)
*Land Registers (Scotland)	*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*	Read 1ª 9th March (74)
Licensing Act Amendment [H.L.]	*Earl of Wemyss*	Read 1ª 19th March (1214)
Light Locomotives (Ireland)	*Marquess of Londonderry*	Read 2ª 16th March (818) Committee 20th March (1367) Report 23rd March (1434)
*Marine Insurance [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 2ª 13th March (726) Committee Report } 20th March (1375)
Militia Ballot [H.L.]	*Earl of Wemyss*	Read 1ª 13th March (723)
*Prevention of Corruption [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 2ª 10th March (237) Committee 20th March (1368)
Prevention of Cruelty to Children Amendment [H.L.]	*Lord Alverstone*	Read 1ª 17th March (986)
Shops [H.L.]	*Lord Sudeley*	Read 1ª 12th March (524)
Shops (Early Closing) [H.L.]	*Lord Avebury*	Read 2ª 12th March (541) Committee 20th March (1341)
Shops (Hours of Closing) [H.L.]	*Lord Ribblesdale*	Second Reading (adjourned) 12th March (526) Bill Withdrawn 20th March (1376)

(B.) House of Commons.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Addenbrooke's Hospital	*Sir Richard Jebb*	Read 1° 19th March (1234)
Bank Holidays (Ireland)	*Mr. O'Mara*	Committee Report 10th March (367) Read 3° and passed 11th March (515)
Bankruptcy Act (1883) Amendment	*Mr. Brynmor Jones*	Read 1° 9th March (114)
*Berwickshire County Town	*The Lord Advocate*	Read 1° 12th March (590)
Church Discipline	*Mr. David MacIver*	Read 2° 13th March (733)
Congested Districts (Scotland)	*Mr. John Dewar*	Read 1° 17th March (1003)
*Contracts (India Office)	*Secretary Lord George Hamilton*	Read 1° 16th March (861)
County Courts [96]	*Sir William Holland*	Read 1° 12th March (590)
Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act (1886) Amendment [109]	*Mr. Weir*	Read 1° 18th March (1110)
False Characters [103]	*Mr. Bousfield*	Read 1° 12th March (704)
Foreigners' Marriages [87]	*Mr. Macdona*	Read 1° 9th March (114)
Grocers' Licences (Scotland) [95]	*Sir John Leng*	Read 1° 12th March (589)
Housing of the Working Classes [90]	*Dr. Macnamara*	Read 1° 10th March (268)
Innkeepers' Liability [8]	*Sir Brampton Gurdon*	Read 2° 6th March (8)
Lands Valuation (Scotland) [93]	*Mr. M'Crae*	Read 1° 10th March (269)
*Licensing Acts Consolidation (Scotland)	*The Lord Advocate*	Read 1° 12th March (590)
Local Government Franchise and Representation (Extension to Companies) [89]	*Sir Albert Rollit*	Read 1° 9th March (115)
Local Government (Scotland) [99]	*Mr. Maxwell*	Read 1° 12th March (590)
Local Records [108]	*Mr. Bull*	Read 1° 18th March (1109)
Out-door Relief (Pensioners) [94]	*Colonel Blundell*	Read 1° 11th March (390)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Petroleum [112]	*Mr. Ure*	Read 1° 19th March (1234)
Poor Law Officers' Superannuation (Scotland) [100]	*Mr. Maxwell*	Read 1° 12th March (590)
Poor Law Superannuation (Ireland) [88]	*Mr. Joyce*	Read 1° 9th March (115)
Poor Prisoners' Defence [102]	*Mr. Bousfield*	Read 1° 12th March (703)
Public Houses (Hours of Closing) (Scotland) [85]	*Sir John Stirling Maxwell*	Second Reading (adjourned) 10th March (367)
Rating of Machinery [2]	*Mr. Chapman*	Read 2° 20th March (1385)
Registration of Firms [101]	*Mr. Emmott*	Read 1° 12th March (591)
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturdays (Ireland) [15]	*Mr. Sloan*	Read 2° 6th March (27)
Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Acts Amendment [92]	*Sir Henry Seton-Karr*	Read 1° 10th March (269)
School Board Electorate (Scotland) [62]	*Mr. Weir*	Second Reading (adjourned) 18th March (1205)
Solicitors (Scotland)	*Mr. Ure*	Read 1° 19th March (1235)
Tied Houses (Freeing) [91]	*Mr. Rea*	Read 1° 10th March (269)

APPENDIX IV.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, SESSION 1903.

LIST OF RULES, ORDERS, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

[*In continuation of List given in previous volume.*]

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Education (Scotland) (Code, 1903).—Copy of Code of Regulations for Day Schools by the Lords of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education in Scotland [35 and 36 Vic., c. 62, s. 67]	13 March	One month
Factory and Workshop Acts (Special Exceptions—Meal Hours in Electrical Stations).—Copy of Order, dated 11th March, 1903, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 40 (4) of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, extending (subject to certain conditions) the special exceptions as to meal hours to young persons above the age of 16 years employed in Electrical Stations [1 Edw. VII., c. 22, s. 126 (3)]	16 March	40 days
Factory and Workshop Acts (Special Exception—Night Work at Electrical Stations).—Copy of Order, dated 11th March, 1903, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 54 (4) of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, extending the special exception under that section (subject to certain conditions) to the Employment at Night in Electrical Stations of male young persons of the age of 16 years and upwards [1 Edw. VII., c. 22, s. 126 (3)]	16 March	40 days
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford).—Copy of Statutes made by the Governing Body of Queen's College, Oxford, on 26th November, 1902, altering Statutes II. and XXIII. and the Statute concerning Exhibitions within the College [40 and 41 Vic., c. 48, s. 50]	17 March	12 weeks
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford).—Copy of Statute made by the Governing Body of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, on 29th November, 1902, amending Clauses 19, 22, and 77 of the College Statutes [40 and 41 Vic., c. 48, s. 50]	17 March	12 weeks
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Cambridge).—Copy of Statutes made by the Governing Body of St. John's College, Cambridge, on 28th November, 1902, amending the College Statutes [40 and 41 Vic., c. 48, s. 50]	17 March	12 weeks
Public Records (Admiralty).—Copy of Tenth Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents which have been removed from the Office of the Commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and deposited in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein [40 and 41 Vic., c. 55, s. 1]	18 March	4 weeks
Board of Education (Code 1903).—Copy of Provisional Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools and Training Colleges, with Schedules by the Board of Education [33 and 34 Vic., c. 75, s. 97]	19 March	One month

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

SECOND VOLUME OF SESSION 1903.

MARCH 6—MARCH 23.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that Stage of the Bill, or on that Vote. Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Aberdeen

New Post Office, Possible length of time required for completion—Grant of further Supplementary Estimate, proposed.
Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes, *Mar. 19*, 1230.

Accidents

Ships—Return of Casualties to Ships, Ordered, *Mar. 17*, 990.

Traction Engines—Number of Accidents caused by Traction Engines employed in work on Great Northern, Brompton and Piccadilly Electric Railway—Time of occurrence—Instances of negligence.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 12*, 559.

Acland-Hood, Sir A.—*Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury* [Somerset, Wellington]

Business of the House — Contradiction between Statements made with regard to, alleged, *Mar. 18*, 1106.

Public Accounts Committee.

Election of, *Mar. 11*, 390.

Postponement of Nomination of Members, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 269.

Supply—Civil Service Estimates—Time of Vote, *Mar. 23*, 1518.

Addenbrooke's Hospital Bill

c. 1R.* *Mar. 19*, 1234.

Aden

Condition of Barracks, Report on — Possibility of Improvement of.
Q. Mr. Orr-Ewing; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 9*, 86.

Operations in Hinterland—Dispatch of additional troops, Cost, Possible length of detention, Operations under control of India Office.
Qs. Mr. C. Hobhouse, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 11*, 380.

Admiralty Yacht

Basis of Tenders for—Adoption of similar plan for harbours, etc., in view of obtaining alternate designs and specifications, proposed.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 23*, 1459.

Adulteration of Food

Adulterated Baking Powder — Case of Norwich shop-keeper, Remittal of part of fine, proposed.
Q. Mr. Price; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 17*, 992.

Advertisements

Foreign Countries—Address for Return, *Mar. 9*, 82.

Advisory Boards

Agricultural Affairs, Direction with regard to.

Os. Sir E. Strachey, *Mar. 23*, 1521; Mr. Courtenay Warner, *Mar. 23*, 1522; Mr. Hanbury, *Mar. 23*, 1523; Sir W. Foster, *Mar. 23*, 1526.

Afghanistan

Anglo-Russian position in Asia, Connexion with.

O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 11*, 457.

Africa, British South

Forced Labour, Establishment of system of, alleged—Possible steps for removal of abuse.

Q. Mr. Levy; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 23*, 1440.

Africa, East

Grant of Return with reference to Concessions in, proposed.

Q. Mr. Malcolm; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 12*, 581.

Africa, South

Cape Rebels—Amnesty of, Decision with regard to.

Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 16*, 846.

Drafts for—Age and size of—Call for Report, proposed.

Qs. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 23*, 1456.

Labour—Importation of—Arrangements for, nature of, with whom made—Presentation of Explanatory Papers, proposed.

Q. Mr. Labouchere; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 23*, 1451.

Mr. Chamberlain's Mission—Possible date of Presentation to Parliament of accurate Report of Statements made at Meetings and Interviews, during mission.

Q. Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 16*, 843.

Native Labour Question—Conference of South African Colonies on, Possible date of Report of—Nature of, and representation of Transvaal and Orange River Colonies and Protectorates.

Qs. Sir C. Dilke, Mr. H. Samuel; *As.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 19*, 1223.

Native Taxation, Proposed Increase in Rate of—Comparison of Tax under British and Transvaal Governments—Opportunity for Discussion of Tax, requested.

Qs. Mr. H. Samuel, Mr. Bryn Roberts, Mr. Keir Hardie; *As.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 18*, 1098.

Vryheid, Addition of, to Colony of Natal, alleged—Necessity of having Sanction of Imperial Parliament, previous to such addition.

Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 16*, 847.

Africa, West

Railways, Construction of—Payment of Commission to Shelford and Son.

Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 6*, 5.

Agriculture, Board of

Constitution and Organisation.

Os. Sir E. Strachey, *Mar. 19*, 1337; Mr. Hanbury, *Mar. 19*, 1338; Mr. Spear, *Mar. 19*, 1339.

Remounts, Action with regard to.

Os. Mr. Soares, *Mar. 23*, 1519; Mr. Hanbury, *Mar. 23*, 1526.

Alaska

Aim of Boundary Convention.

Q. Mr. Rose; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 23*, 1459.

Boundary Tribunal—Official Nomination of Commissioners on.

Q. Mr. Rose; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 18*, 1098.

Alderley, Lord Stanley of

Intrusive Patronage in North Wales—Conduct of Royal Commission criticised—Alienation or transfer of North Wales Benefices to South Wales Sees—Arguments against introduction of South Wales Clergymen into North Wales—Companies owned by Clergymen contrary to the Statute, and other Ecclesiastical Abuses, *Mar. 9*, 63.

Aliens

Address for Return Presented, *Mar. 6*, 4.

Criminals—Number of, in English Prisons—Proportion of, to total Prison Population—Cost of Detention—Restoration of Criminals to Native Country on Expiration of Sentence—Proportion of Foreign Criminals to Foreign Population.

Qs. Mr. Powell-Williams, Mr. C. Hay; *As.* Mr. Akers-Douglas, *Mar. 18*, 1103.

Return—Addition to, of Total Cost of carrying out Sentences passed upon Criminals, proposed.

Q. Mr. Powell-Williams; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 9*, 108.

Immigration.

Deportation from France of Criminals to this Conntry—Representations to French Government, proposed.

Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 18*, 1101.

Non-enforcement of Section 3 of Act, empowering Customs Officers to demand Name, Origin and Passport of Aliens landing in this Country.

Q. Mr. Golding; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 10*, 259.

Rejection of Immigrants as Undesirables at Liverpool, alleged—Number of those who were Rejected, but remained.

Q. Mr. F. Ridley; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 6*, 7.

[*cont.*

Aliens—*cont.*
  Immigration—*cont.*
    United States—Imposition of further Restrictions upon Alien Immigration in—Steps for Prevention of—Deportation of Aliens Rejected by United States, to this Country.
      Q. Mr. M. Hall; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 11*, 380.
  Lunatics landed at Tilbury Docks and supported by Ossett Union Guardians, alleged.
      Q. Lieutenant-Colonel Tufnell; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 10*, 256.
  Paupers—Number of in this country and particularly in London.
      Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 10*, 265.
  Return presented, *Mar. 23*, 1438.
  Wage Disputes between—Necessity of interpreting evidence, Consequent delay in hearing of cases of Englishmen at Worship Street Police Court—Remedy of defects, proposed.
      Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 17*, 997.

Allan, Sir W. [Gateshead]
  "Enchantress," Tenders for, not invited from certain shipbuilding firms, alleged—Cause of omission—Form of Contract with Messrs. Harland and Wolff, *Mar. 9*, 89.
  "Good Hope," H.M.S., Speed and Coal Consumption, *Mar. 9*, 88.
  Machinery Rating Bill—Objections to the Bill as taxing the worker instead of the machine, *Mar. 20*, 1405.
  "Russell," H.M.S., Machinery, Nature of defects in—causing delay in joining Mediterranean Fleet, *Mar. 11*, 379.
  Supply—Navy Estimates.
    Expenditure on construction, re-construction and repairs—Inefficiency of vessels—Protest against use of water-tube boilers—Vast outlay without satisfactory return, *Mar. 16*, 948.
    Reason in favour of an increase in numbers—Undermanning of ships, *Mar. 23*, 1507.
    Salaries of Officers, etc.—Ship formation against good gunnery, *Mar. 17*, 1061.

All Saints, Poplar (Rate Abolition) Bill
  l. 2R.* *Mar. 19*, 1209.

Alvestone, Lord—*Lord Chief Justice*
  Prevention of Corruption Bill.
    Necessity for measures proposed—Distinction between "corrupt" and other commissions, *Mar. 10*, 243.
    Suggested amendments—Bribes after the act, etc.—Adequacy of punishment, *Mar. 20*, 1368, 1369, 1372, 1373.

Anson, Sir W. — *Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education* [Oxford University]
  Education—Betton Charity, Scheme for future regulation of payment of grants under, *Mar. 13*, 733.
  Education Act.
    Applications under Section 11 [1]—Number and Nature of—Orders for transformation of undenominational into denominational teaching—Possible action of Board with regard to, *Mar. 23*, 1446.
    Grants under, payment of by instalments—Possible continuance of practice for year 1904-1905, *Mar. 23*, 1447.
    Schemes for Approval.
      Number submitted to Board of Education, Number having received final approval, *Mar. 9*, 86.
      Number submitted by Town Councils, returned for alteration—Case of Loughborough Town Council Scheme, *Mar. 19*, 1218.
    School Trust Deeds—Applications for variation of—Applications for, in Schools where they previously did not exist, Number of Cases of Schools formerly undenominational becoming denominational, *Mar. 10*, 255.
  High Pavement Board School, Nottingham—Inadequate Accommodation for Scholars, under new rules, Transfer of Scholars to All Saints' National Schools, proposed—Inconvenience of such a transference to Scholars, Reconsideration of decision, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 265; *Mar. 12*, 584.
  King's Scholarships — Regulation prohibiting information as to marks being given to Candidates failing to obtain a Second Class, Rescinding of, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1228.
  Mydrim Elementary School—Carmarthenshire—Nonpayment of Government Grant, alleged, *Mar. 12*, 562.
  Supply—Education Vote.
    Board of Education and the Leicestershire County Council, *Mar. 19*, 1318, 1319.
    Answers to questions and criticisms—Employment of Pupil-Teachers—Physical Drill in Schools—Formation of a Departmental Committee to inquire into Physical Training, *Mar. 19*, 1325.
    Local Authorities and the Board of Education, *Mar. 19*, 1330.
    Unsuccessful Students at King's College—Non-provided Schools, *Mar. 19*, 1333, 1334.
  Training College Examinations—Omission of Practical Examination in Science—Reconsideration of Decision with regard to, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1446.
  Wales—National Museum Grant, *Mar. 10*, 357.

Argentine

Finance—Delay in Issue of Consular Report on, alleged.
Q. Mr. Rose; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 9*, 105.

Arkwright, Mr. [Hereford]

Supply—Education Vote—Physical Training in Schools, *Mar. 19*, 1319.

Armstrong, Sir Walter

Irish National Gallery—His Irregularity with the Accounts of.
Qs. Mr. Gibson Bowles, *Mar. 18*, 1110; Mr. Hayes Fisher, *Mar. 18*, 1111; Mr. Lough, *Mar. 18*, 1112.

Army

Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. St. John Brodrick.
Under Secretary—Earl of Hardwicke.
Financial Secretary—Lord Stanley.

Army Corps.

Analysis of the System—*Debate on Supply* (Army Estimates), *Mar. 12*, 591.

Manœuvres, Proposed localities for.
Q. Mr. Malcolm; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 95.

Bandoliers, Unsuitability of those employed during South African War—Issue of Suitable Equipment.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 16*, 839.

British Campaigns and Expeditions—Number of, during the last Ten Years, Number of Troops employed, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 96.

Buildings on Salisbury Plain—Map showing Buildings erected or in course of construction on, to be placed in Tea Room.
Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 96.

Cavalry Arms.

Abolition of Lance, Grounds for.
Q. Major Wyndham-Quin; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 16*, 840.

Employment of both Rifle and Sword.
Q. Colonel Legge; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 16*, 842.

Clothing Factory, Annual Account Presented, *Mar. 19*, 1216.

Commissioners, Grant of Return in respect of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 19*, 1223.

Cost of Military Aid to Civil Power—Charge upon Local Authority seeking Assistance—Legislation proposed.
Q. Mr. D. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 9*, 84.

Drafts for South Africa, Age and Size of—Call for Report, proposed.
Qs. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 23*, 1456.

Excess Troops, Pay of under what constitutional or Parliamentary Authority.
Q. Mr. Malcolm; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 11*, 377.

Army—*cont.*

First Battalion Grenadier Guards.

Condition of affairs under Colonel Kinloch's Command, Excessive strength of battalion—Number of recruits joining battalion, number of officers and non-commissioned officers and men equipped for South Africa—Number invalided home passing through battalion—Number of Officers joining—Lack of senior subalterns — Quartermaster, orderly room clerk—Non-Commissioned Officers — Application by Colonel Kinloch for Clerical help.
Qs. Duke of Bedford, Lord Ribblesdale; *As.* Duke of Bedford, Earl of Hardwicke, *Mar. 10*, 243, 246.

Evidence taken before Court of Inquiry — Undesirability of publication of, grounds for refusal.
Qs. Mr. Swift MacNeill, Mr. Labouchere; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 12*, 571.

Flogging of Drummer boys of—Circumstances of case—Steps for prevention of recurrence.
Q. Mr. O'Mara; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 16*, 841.

Mock Courts-Martial.

Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed—Evidence taken before Court of Inquiry demanded.
Qs. Mr. Labouchere; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 12*, 569.

Refusal to Grant — Reconsideration of decision, proposed.
Q. Mr. Pirie; (No Answer), *Mar. 12*, 570.

Strength of Battalion exceeding that of ordinary battalion, during Colonel Kinloch's command, alleged.
Q. Duke of Bedford; *A.* Earl of Hardwicke, *Mar. 10*, 243.

Flogging of Drummer Boys—Breach of King's Regulations with regard to, Laying on Table of Evidence, proposed.
Qs. Mr. W. Redmond and Colonel Nolan; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 12*, 572.

General Annual Return—Possible date of reissuing of.
Q. Mr. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 94.

Guard Rooms—Improved Sleeping Accommodation in, proposed.
Q. Mr. Colston; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 19*, 1221.

Horses, *see* that title.

India, *see* that title.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
Lance Practice—Withdrawal of from Course of Training—Deprivation of Men of Lancer Regiments of Extra Pay for Increased Efficiency.
Q. Colonel Legge ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 17*, 996.
Lance *v.* Sword.
Greater Efficiency of Former, alleged.
Q. Mr. Norton ; (No Answer), *Mar. 16*, 842.
Substitution of Lance for Sword in Lancers, Dragoon Guards and Dragoons Regiments — Reconsideration of, proposed—Issue of Order with reference to, on approval of Inspector General of Cavalry.
Qs. Colonel Legge, Major W. Quin ; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 12*, 676.
Lancers—Prizes for Lance Practice—Discontinuance of.
Q. Colonel Legge ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 12*, 576.
Land Forces—*Debate* [H.C.] on—Resolution reported, *Mar. 18*, 1120.
Lieutenant-Colonel Kinloch, C.B., M.V.O. —Evidence of, before Court of Inquiry, Presented, *Mar. 13*, 705, 730.
Medical Department — Organisation Improved.
Os. Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 10*, 307 ; Dr. Farquharson, *Mar. 11*, 418.
Militia, *see* that title.
Motion to go into *Com. of Supply—Debate* [H.C.] *Mar. 10*, 270.
Officers.
Compulsorily Retired or Dismissed.
Circumstances of Retirement—Number of Officers placed on Half-Pay—Similar Details for Militia and Volunteers requested.
Q. Mr. Pirie ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1094 ; Copy Presented of, *Mar. 11*, 372 ; Return of, *Mar. 12*, 524.
Education—Inclusion of Provision in New Regulations with regard to Promotion of Qualified Non-Commissioned Officers to Commissioned Rank, proposed.
Q. Mr. Randles ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 12*, 568.
Expenses, Reduction of, thus enabling Officers to meet Expenses without recourse to private means.
Q. Mr. Powell-Williams ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 97.
Half Pay.
Eligible for Re-employment, Number of, Compulsorily placed on Half Pay List—Possible Re-employment of.
Q. Mr. Pirie ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1095.

Army—*cont.*
Officers—*cont.*
Half-pay—*cont.*
Increase of, in 1903 compared with 1902-3 — Explanation requested.
Q. Mr. Pirie ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 17*, 995.
Totals for Half Pay required for Officers Eligible for Employment—Percentage of Sums —Also that of Non-effective Vote to Army Estimates.
Q. Mr. Pirie ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 16*, 840.
Removal—*Debate, Mar. 11*, 475.
Uniforms—Issue of Circular to Firms of Tailors for Terms for Supplying —Exclusion of Irish Firms, alleged.
Q. Mr. Flynn ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 11*, 378.
Ordnance Departments—Tenders for Contract 2/1773—Acceptance of Lowest Tender.
Q. Mr. C. Hay ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 17*, 995.
Ordnance Factories—Annual Account Presented, *Mar. 19*, 1216.
Pay, Allowances, etc.—*Debate* [H.C.] *on Supply*—Resolution reported, *Mar. 18*, 1165.
Recruiting.
Annual Report Presented, *Mar. 6*, 2.
Rejections on Account of Defective Teeth—Percentage of for Present Year.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick ; *Mar. 18*, 1093.
Transfer of Recruits from Militia to Army—Inclusion of, in Numbers of both Militia and Army—thus Reckoning One Recruit as Two.
Q. Mr. C. Hay ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 98.
Recruits—Boy Recruits—Enlistment of, against personal wishes—Case of Frank Glover.
Qs. Mr. Bell ; *As.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 11*, 382.
Remount Department—Employment of Retired Officers of Veterinary Department as Purchasing Officers in, proposed
Q. Captain Norton ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1097.
Reserve—Condition and Organisation.
Os. Mr. Guest, *Mar. 10*, 324 ; Mr. Arthur Lee, *Mar. 11*, 406 ; Lieut.-Gen. Laurie, *Mar. 11*, 420 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 11*, 460.
Reservists—Number of, in receipt of Pay—Number not in receipt of Messing Allowance.
Q. Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 93.

Army—*cont.*
Returns.
Conditions of Classification of Regulars as Effective—Distinction in Army Estimates between Recruits and Effectives, proposed.
Q. Colonel Welby; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1096.
Grant of, in respect of Volunteers—Army Reserves—Military Works and Royal Garrison Regiments, proposed.
Qs. Mr. W. Churchill; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 96.
Royal Artillery Commissions—University Candidates for—Standard required, Method of Selection.
Q. Mr. R. Lucas; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 23*, 1454.
Soldiers Discharged without Pension—Number of so Discharged since Outbreak of South African War for Diseases not directly attributable to Active Service — More thorough Medical Examination of Recruits proposed.
Q. Earl of Mayo; *A.* Earl of Hardwicke, *Mar. 19*, 1212.
Staff Service—Medical Examination of Officers previous to Appointments on Staff, and Compulsory Return to Regimental Duty after Five Years Staff Service—Exceptions to Regulations.
Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 17*, 996.
Strength of.
As shown in Army Estimates—Page 12—Number of Effectives of all Ranks — Proportion of Fully Trained Men to Total Number.
Qs. Colonel Welby; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 97.
Inclusion of Men on Gratuity Furlough in calculation of.
Q. Mr. Goulding; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 98.
Inclusion of Militia and Volunteer Staffs, in Total Strength of the Army.
Q. Mr. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 94.
Three Hundred Men out of every Battalion Non-Effective, alleged.
Q. Mr. A. Lee; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 98.

Army Estimates
Abstract of, with comparison between Estimates of 1902–1903—1903–1904, Presented, *Mar. 9*, 63, 80.
Annual Statement—Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 10*, 294.
Appendices to, Possible date of issue.
Q. Captain Sinclair; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 20*, 1384.

Army Estimates—*cont.*
General Staff, Regiments, Reserve and Departments, £9,647,000, *Com. Mar. 12*, 591.
Increase of Army and pay and pension—Schemes, Effect on non-effective votes of.
Q. Sir E. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 13*, 730.
Land Forces, Number of (235,761), *Com. Mar. 10*, 294.
Memorandum Relating to, Presented, *Mar. 6*, 2.
Non-effective Votes of, Effect of increase of Army and terms of pay and pension on.
Q. Sir E. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *Mar. 11*, 374.
Retired Pay, Half-Pay, etc., £1,638,000, *Com. Mar. 12*, 683.
Training of Officers—*Debate* (c.) *Mar. 9*, 115.
Veterinary Department, Status, Pay, etc., of Officers in.
Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1097.
Os. Captain Norton, *Mar. 18*, 1165; Lord Stanley, *Mar. 18*, 1168.

Army Works Bill
Sum required under—Possible expenditure within next Financial Year.
Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 23*, 1457.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. — *Secretary to the Admiralty* [Belfast, West]
Admiralty Yacht, Was tender on definite design and specification, or were firms to submit their own designs—Adoption of latter plan for harbours, etc., in view of obtaining alternative designs and specifications, proposed, *Mar. 23* 1459.
Boy Artificers in the Navy—Dissatisfaction arising from Limitation of Right to Sit for Examination as, to Sons of Officers of certain Ranks only—Revision of Conditions, *Mar. 10*, 259.
Canadian Naval Reserve, Establishment of, Independent of Imperial Authority —Action of British Government, *Mar. 17*, 996.
Chatham Dockyard, Private Footpaths in —Reservation of, for use of Officers only, Removal of Order previous to; and Replacement of, subsequent to Visit of First Lord, alleged, *Mar. 23*, 1443.
Coastguard Signal Stations, Names of Stations at present and about to be Fitted with Wireless Telegraphy Apparatus, *Mar. 23*, 1457.
"Enchantress," Tenders for, not invited from certain Shipbuilding Firms, alleged, Cause of Omission—Form of Contract with Messrs. Harland and Wolff, *Mar. 9*, 89.

[*cont.*

Arnold-Forster, Mr.—*cont.*

Fleet, Manning of—Committee's Report, Circulation of, previous to Discussion of Navy Estimates, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 259.

"Good Hope," H.M.S.—Speed and Coal Consumption, *Mar. 9*, 88.

"Hannibal," H.M.S. — Oil Fuel Trials on, General Results of, *Mar. 11*, 378.

Marine Engineering Committee—Names of Members of, Strengthening of Equipment of Board—possible Date of Appointment, *Mar. 12*, 576.

Men of War, Glass Balls on Mastheads—by whom purchased, *Mar. 23*, 1444.

Naval Base, Establishment of New—Decision with regard to, Claims of the Tyne, *Mar. 9*, 83.

Naval Cadetships for Executive Officers, etc.—Nominations to Compete for Entrance to "Britannia" for—Number of, by whom Granted, under New Scheme, *Mar. 16*, 834.

Naval Gunnery—Prizewinners, Display of Names of, Score and Nature of Gun on Lower Deck of each Ship, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1443.

Naval Medical Department—Promotion and Pay—Improvement in respect to, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1444.

Naval Schoolmasters' Pensions—Extension of Increased Chief Petty Officers' Pension to Schoolmasters, *Mar. 11*, 375.

Naval Service on Royal Yacht—Practice with regard to Promotion of Officers subsequent to — Continuance of, Practice, *Mar. 16*, 834.

Naval Training, Memoranudm on—Omission of Signatures of Commissioners, with exception of one—Reason for Omission, *Mar. 16*, 847.

Naval Victualling.

Increased Cost under New Victualling Scheme—Increased Allowance to Pensioners in consequence, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1445.

Improved Scale of Rations, accompanied by Improved System of Cooking and Serving Food, *Mar. 23*, 1443.

Naval Warrant Officers—Promotion of, to Lieutenants under New Navy Scheme, *Mar. 13*, 732.

Naval Works Bill—Possible Introduction of during present Session—Amount to be borrowed under, *Mar. 16*, 847.

Navy

Flag List—Deficiency in Numbers of Younger Officers on, *Mar. 11*, 577.

King's Regulations, Changes in—Recommendations for Sanction of, by Order in Council, *Mar. 16*, 848.

Lord Goschen's Committee — Recommendations of—Laying on Table of Report previous to Discussion on Navy Estimates, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 577.

Arnold-Forster, Mr.—*cont.*

Navy - *cont.*

New Ration System—Date of coming into Operation, *Mar. 9*, 89.

Nominations for—Number of Vacancies, *Mar. 19*, 1220.

New Army Rifle—Proposed Adoption by Admiralty—Further Trials of, previous to Final Adoption, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 379.

Oil Fuel Storage—Immediate carrying out of Arrangements for Provision of, or Postponement of until further trials have been made with Oil Fuel, *Mar. 16*, 848.

Osborne Naval College, Character of—Possible relation to Dartmouth Naval College—Accommodation etc., *Mar. 23*, 1458.

Portsmouth Harbour, Swing Bridge — Substitution of for Permanent Bridge, proposed—Steps to procure Abandonment of proposal, *Mar. 9*, 100.

Promotions of Warrant Officers to Lieutenants—Method of Promotion under new Navy Scheme, *Mar. 9*, 89.

Royal Marines—Arrangement of Optional Courses for Officers under new Scheme, *Mar. 13*, 732.

"Russell," H.M.S., Machinery—Nature of Defects in, Causing Delay in joining Mediterranean Fleet, *Mar. 11*, 379.

Supply—Navy Estimates.

Justification for Enormous Expenditure — *Personnel* — Addition to Royal Fleet Reserves — Naval Volunteers — New Scheme of Training—Promotion of Warrant Officers — Chief Petty Officers' Pensions — Mechanicians — Boy Artificers — Royal Marines — *Matériel* — New Construction — New Year's Programme—Repairs—Armaments—Standardisation—Distribution of Fleets—Coaling Arrangements—New Naval Base, Organisation for War, *Mar. 16*, 861.

Mercantile Marine Reserves—Active Service Ratings—Effect of Shipbuilding Enterprise on Foreign Countries — Fleet Reserve, *Mar. 23*, 1493.

Nominations in relation to Vacancies, *Mar. 16*, 920.

Answers to Criticism—Question of the Age of Entry, System of Nomination—Justification for Admiralty Scheme, etc., *Mar. 16*, 929.

Pensions, Half-pay, etc.—Scope of the Vote, *Mar. 18*, 1117.

Question of Scotch Canal, *Mar. 16*, 972.

Question of reporting Progress, *Mar. 16*, 973.

Arnold-Forster, Mr.—*cont.*
Supply—Navy Estimates—*cont.*
Salaries of Officers, etc.—Justification for Expenditure—Construction of Ships—Question of Negotiations with Foreign Powers—Colonial Contributions — Promotion of Warrant Officers—Necessity for Additional Ships and Men, *Mar. 17*, 1043.
Naval Gunnery, *Mar. 17*, 1051, 1056, 1057, 1059.
Transport Service—Sea Transport Medal. Eligibility of Officers of Ships conveying Troops during South African War, to receive Medal, *Mar. 13*, 731.
Seaman, Imprisonment of a—Case of R. Moore, Revision of Sentence proposed, *Mar. 9*, 87.
Shipbuilding at Devonport — Arrangements for Construction of One New Battleship at, *Mar. 18*, 1090.
Supply.
Colonial Vote—South African Affairs, Necessity for Exhaustive Information on—Question of Loans, *Mar. 19*, 1244, 1248.
Estimates.
Army — Land Forces — Reasons in Favour of Withdrawal of the Motion, *Mar. 18*, 1161.
Civil Service — Standing Order, *Mar. 23*, 1518.
Navy—Reason against Reduction of Numbers in the Navy—Non-continuous Service, *Mar. 23*, 1512, 1513.

Assizes Acts
Orders in Council Presented, *Mar. 17*, 985, 988.

Aston Manor Improvement Bill
l. Com. March 9, 61.

Atkinson, Mr.—*Attorney General for Ireland*—[Londonderry, N.]
Bank Holidays (Ireland) Bill, *Mar. 10*, 367.
Midland and Belfast and Northern Counties Railways Bill—Reasons for Support of, 2R. *Mar. 23*, 1542.

Attorney-General's Fiat
Requirements, previous to Granting or Withholding Fiat to Plaintiffs.
Q. Mr. D. Thomas ; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 16*, 852.

Avebury, Lord
Shops (Early Closing) Bill.
Evils of Long Hours — Hours in Bakeries — Comparison of Bill with that of Lord Ribblesdale—Consideration of Shopkeepers' Interests—Medical Evidence on the Evils resulting from Overwork in Shops, *Mar. 12*, 541.

Avebury, Lord—*cont.*
Shops (Early Closing) Bill—*cont.*
Questions of Precedence between Different Bills on the Same Subject — Variations in Different Neighbourhoods—Conflicting Interests of Employers and Employed—Attitude of Trades Unions, *Mar. 20*, 1346.
Powers of Shopkeepers and Local Authorities, *Mar. 20*, 1350.
Question of a Memorial—Favourable Attitude of London Shopkeepers, *Mar. 20*, 1353.
Favourable Attitude of Shop-Assistants, *Mar. 20*, 1360.
Remarks on Amendments, *Mar. 20*, 1362, 1365, 1366.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J., *Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury* [Manchester, E.]
Budget, Possible date of Introduction. *Mar. 9*, 114.
Business of the House—Course of Business—Replies to Questions, *Mar. 10*, 267.
Church Discipline Bill—Inaction of the Moderate High Church Party—Difficulties of the Bishops in dealing with Ritualistic practices—Objections to burden of Costs on the Episcopal Bench—Reasons against the abolition of the Veto—Importance of dealing with spiritualistic matters through a spiritualistic authority—Reasons for opposition to a Second Reading of the Bill, *Mar. 13*, 786.
Committees and Commissions — List of subjects under investigation of, at present time, *Mar. 19*, 1222.
Cunard Agreement—Form of, and possible date of receiving Parliamentary assent, *Mar. 13*, 730.
Delhi Durbar—Omission of grant of boon or concession on occasion of—Steps to rectify omission, *Mar. 16*, 833.
Education Bill for London—Possible date of introduction, *Mar. 16*, 860.
Employment of Children Bill — Second Reading, possible date of, *Mar. 19*, 1232.
Food Supply in Time of War, Government inquiry into—Constitution, scope, date of appointment, *Mar. 11*, 390.
Forth-Clyde Canal—Consideration of proposed by Defence Committee, *Mar. 11*, 388.
Irish Land Bill—Possible date of introduction, *Mar. 12*, 589 ; *Mar. 16*, 860.
Macedonia, Affairs in — Memoranda of Madame Bakhmetieff—Steps taken by Government to secure copies of—Circulation to Members, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 95.

[*cont.*

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*

National Defence, Committee of—Submission of constitution and powers of, to Inquiry Commission, *Mar. 16*, 857.

Parliament—House of Commons—Hours of meeting—Proposal for Members to meet at 2 o'clock instead of 2.30 on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and for termination of Questions to take place at 3.25 instead of 2.55, *Mar. 11*, 388.

Parliamentary Procedure—New Rules—Supply to come before Bill under, *Mar. 19*, 1234.

Prevention of Corruption Bill—Expediency of pressing forward Bill, *Mar. 11*, 389.

Private Banks Balance Sheets—Introduction of legislation enforcing publication of, *Mar. 16*, 858.

Private Bill Procedure—Introduction of legislation with view to curtailing work of Private Committees and lessening expense of promoting Private Bills, *Mar. 13*, 731.

Private Business, Recommendations of Select Committee on — Steps for carrying into effect, *Mar. 11*, 389.

St. Louis Exposition—Representation of British and Irish industries at—appointment of Royal Commission in regard to, *Mar. 16*, 853.

Supply—Army Estimates –Motion to go into Committee, *Mar. 10*, 291.

- Land Forces—Length of the Debate, *Mar. 10*, 347.
  - Dangers to Indian Frontier from Russia, *Mar. 10*, 348.
  - Defence of Indian Frontier, *Mar. 11*, 400, 401, 432.
  - Auxiliary Forces recognised as the Home Defence—Relative strength of Army and Navy—Defence of Indian Frontier—Dangers of Russian Hostilities—Partition of Afghanistan—Necessity for keeping up numbers in the Army and for strengthening the Reserve, *Mar. 11*, 451.
  - Time for consideration of Votes, *Mar. 18*, 1155.
- Navy Estimates—Pensions, half-pay, etc.—Question of non-effective votes, *Mar. 18*, 1113.
  - Reasons for order of the introduction of Votes, *March 18*, 1114.
  - Position of the Government with regard to discussion, *Mar. 18*, 1115.
  - Salaries of Officers, etc.—Appeal to Committee to assent to Vote, *March 17*, 1064.
  - Opportunity for discussion, *Mar. 17*, 1065.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*President of the Board of Trade* [Leeds, Central]

Aliens Immigration.

- Rejection of Immigrants as undesirables at Liverpool, alleged — Number of those who were rejected but remained, *Mar. 6*, 7.
- Non-enforcement of Section 3 of Act, empowering Customs Officers to demand Name, Origin, and Passport of Aliens landing in this country, *Mar. 10*, 259.

Braunton (North Devon) Lighthouse—Connection of with Braunton—Delay in commencement of work, alleged, *Mar. 9*, 90.

Brussels Sugar Convention—Obligation of H.M. Government to submit Convention to British Colonies and India—Number of Colonies before which it has been submitted—Their views to be laid on the Table, *Mar. 9*, 107.

Buncrana and Cardonagh Railway—Appointment of Arbitrators in connection with—Amount certified by, to be due and payable by the Donegal County Council on foot of the guarantee, *Mar. 9*, 113.

Denaby and Cadeby Collieries.—Strike of Colliers, Distress resulting from—Putting into operation of Conciliation Act, proposed, *Mar. 17*, 998.

Dunnottar Coastguard Service.—Unsuitable position of Station, out of sight of Dangerous Rocks, resulting in alleged delay in rendering assistance to schooner "Benmore"—Maintenance of watch on headland, in communication with Station, proposed, *Mar. 17*, 991.

Export Bounties—Canadian and Australian — On export of Butter and Iron — Importation of bounty-fed Articles into United Kingdom, other than Sugar — Protection of Home Industries, *Mar. 16*, 850.

International Mercantile Marine Company—Agreement between H.M. Government and—Lines and scope of—Violation of Merchant Shipping Act, alleged, *Mar. 23*, 1462.

Irish Lights Board—Possible introduction of Measure with view to reconstituting—Government attitude towards Private Member's Bill, *Mar. 9*, 90.

New German Tariff — Countervailing Duties on British Exports to Germany, increase of, alleged—Imposition of Duties on German Goods imported into Great Britain, or Revision of Tariff, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1217.

Penrhyn Quarry Dispute, Settlement of—Steps to be taken under Conciliation Act, *Mar. 16*, 850.

Port of London Bill—Possible Date of Introduction, Taking of Second Reading before Easter, *Mar. 16*, 849.

"Wash" and "Cockchafer"—Date of Purchase, Price Paid, Cost of Maintenance, *Mar. 10*, 261.

Balfour of Burleigh, Lord—*Secretary for Scotland.*
Land Writs.
Defective System of Registration of—Involving Expense of Time and Labour — Recommendations of Committee to Report on Method of Registration, with regard to Adoption of Process of Photo-Zincography — Bill to Legalize this System of Registration, Presented and Read, 1ª, *Mar. 9*, 74.
Bill Introduced for Less Elaborate and Tedious System of Control and Procedure relating to the Records of Writs for Land, Issued in Scotland, *Mar. 9*, 74.
Shops (Early Closing) Bill—County Fund in Scotland, *Mar. 20*, 1366.
Shops (Hours of Closing) Bill—Question of Adjournment in Favour of Lord Avebury's Early Closing Bill, *Mar. 12*, 538, 539.

Bakeries
Long Hours of Assistants.
O. Lord Avebury, *Mar. 12*, 542.

Banbury, Sir Frederick [Camberwell, Peckham]
City and N.E. Surburban Electric Railway Bill—Reasons for leaving any Bills regarding New Railways to the Royal Commission, *Mar. 12*, 664.
London County Council (General Powers) Bill — Suggested Amendments respecting Electric Lighting, Fittings, etc. — Municipalities in Competition with Retail Dealers, *Mar. 23*, 1545.
Powers of Provincial Towns, *Mar. 23*, 1548.
Electric Light Fittings Supplied by Retail Shops, *Mar. 23*, 1549.
Instructions to Committee, *Mar. 23*, 1550.
London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill — Objections to Bill—Trams over Westminster Bridge, *Mar. 23*, 1537.
School Board Electorate (Scotland) Bill, *Mar. 18*, 1207.

Bangor Diocese
Petitions in favour of restoration of patronage of benefices to Bishop of Bangor, *Mar. 9*, 62.

Bank Holidays (Ireland) Bill
c. *Com. Mar. 10*, 366.
Report, *Mar. 10*, 367.
con. Mar. 11*, 515.
3R.* *Mar. 11*, 515.
l. 1R.* *Mar. 12*, 525.
2R.* *Mar. 17*, 986.
Com. Mar. 20*, 1375.
3R.* *Mar. 23*, 1434.

Bankruptcy Act Amendment Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 9*, 114,

Barnard, Lord
Shops (Hours of Closing) Bill—Question of Adjournment in favour of Lord Avebury's Early Closing Bill, *Mar. 12*, 541.

Barrar, Mr. [Leeds, N.]
Machinery Rating Bill—Reasons for support, *Mar. 20*, 1414.

Barry Railway Bill
l. *Com.* Mar. 19*, 1209.

Bartley, Sir G. [Islington, N.]
Budget—Possible date of introduction, *Mar. 9*, 114.
South African War Medals--Possible date of distribution, *Mar. 16*, 842.

Bayley, Mr. T. [Derbyshire, Chesterfield]
Postal Officials as Candidates for Parliament—Extension of privilege enjoyed by Military and Naval Officers, of being placed on half-pay for purpose of seeking election in Parliament, to Postal Officials, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1219.

Beckenham Urban District Council Bill
c. Ordered, *Mar. 11*, 370.

Beckett, Mr. [Yorkshire, N.R., Whitby]
Supply—Army Estimates—Land Forces—Army Corps, *Mar. 11*, 426.
Attitude of the Country towards Expenditure—Relative Needs of Army and Navy—Volunteers as Home Defence – Inadequacy of Intelligence Department — Deficient Training Grounds — Defence of Indian Frontier, *Mar. 18*, 1133.
Total Strength of the Army, *Mar. 18*, 1146.

Bedford, Duke of
Colonel Kinloch, Sentence passed on for Dereliction of Duty—No opportunity afforded him to defend himself until nine days after promulgation of sentence, *Mar. 10*, 246.
First Grenadier Guards—Condition of Affairs under Colonel Kinloch's Command—Excessive Strength of Battalion—Number of Recruits joining Battalion—Number of Officers and Non-commissioned Officers and Men equipped for South Africa—Number invalided home passing through Battalion—Number of Officers joining —Lack of Senior Subalterns, Quartermaster, Orderly Room Clerk, Non-commissioned Officers—Application by Colonel Kinloch for Clerical Help, *Mar. 10*, 243.

Belfast Water Bill
l. *Com. Mar. 9*, 61.

Belhaven, Lord
First Grenadier Guards Scandal—Personal Explanation with regard to Allegation made by Secretary of State for War concerning his visit to the Commander-in-Chief and verbal complaint of treatment of officers in Grenadier Guards, *Mar. 10*, 248.

Bell, Mr. [Derby]
Army Recruits, Boy Recruits—Enlistment of against Personal Wishes, Case of Frank Glover, *Mar. 11*, 382.
Penrhyn Quarry Dispute, Settlement of—Steps to be taken under Conciliation Act, *Mar. 16*, 850.

Belper, Lord
Shops (Early Closing) Bill—Action of the Home Office—Question of Local Authority—Favourable Attitude of the Government, *Mar. 12*, 554.
Local Authorities and Attitude of the Shopkeepers, *Mar. 20*, 1354.
Motion to omit Draft-order with regard to Public Houses, News-agencies, etc., *Mar. 20*, 1357.
Reasons against granting unrestricted Freedom to Local Authorities, *Mar. 20*, 1361.
Question of Provisional Order, *Mar. 20*, 1363.
Suggested Amendments, *Mar. 20*, 1364, 1365, 1366.

Bermuda
Boer Prisoners at—Number deported, detainment in Prison and Treatment as common Criminals, subsequent to Proclamation of Peace.
Qs. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 12*, 573.
Number of—Circumstances of Detention—Possible Date of Return to South Africa.
Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 16*, 846.

Berwickshire County Town Bill
c. 1R*, *Mar. 12*, 590.

Bhownaggree, Sir M. [Bethnal Green, N.E.]
Aliens, Wage Disputes between—Necessity of Interpreting Evidence, Consequent Delay in Hearing of Cases of Englishmen at Worship Street Police Court, Remedy of Defects, proposed, *Mar. 17*, 997.

Bignold, Mr. [Wick Burghs]
Trawling in Moray Firth by British Trawlers under Norwegian Flag—Possible Action of Government, *Mar. 9*, 87.

Birdcage Walk
Defective Condition of Carriage Way, alleged, Transfer of Maintenance to Local Authority, proposed.
Q. Mr. Kearley; *A.* Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes, *Mar. 23*, 1466.

Birmingham Corporation Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 61.

Black, Mr. [Banffshire]
Defence of the Empire—Acquisition of Land for National Defence—Grant of Return relative to, proposed, *Mar. 23* 1457.
New Naval Base, Proposed Establishment of, at St. Margaret's Hope—Extent and Rental of Land to be Acquired for, *Mar. 18*, 1097.
Sheep Worrying in Scotland—Possible Date of Introduction of Bill with Regard to, *Mar. 19*, 1228.
Supply—Colonial Vote—South African Affairs—Question of Language—Compensation under Terms of Peace—Native Labour—Loans, *Mar. 19*, 1249.
Transvaal War Contribution—Despatch from Lord Milner on Subject of—Presentation of Correspondence, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1100.

Blackheath and Greenwich District Electric Light Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 11*, 369.

Blundell, Colonel [Lancashire, Ince]
Supply—Army Estimates.
Pay of Army—Army Corps System, *Mar. 12*, 612.
Training of Officers—University Candidates—Causes of early South African Reverses, *Mar. 9*, 174.

Boer Prisoners
Detention of in Ceylon—Number detained, having refused to take Oath of Allegiance—Illtreatment of, alleged—Possible Date of Return to South Africa.
Qs. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 11*, 375.
Detention of in Ceylon, India, and Bermuda Subsequent to conclusion of Peace—Treatment of within purview of War Office and Secretary of State for War.
Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr Brodrick, *Mar. 16*, 844.
Detention and Illtreatment of, in Ceylon India, and Bermuda subsequent to conclusion of Peace—On whose Authority.
Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 16*, 844.
Deportation of to India, Ceylon, and Bermuda—Number deported, Detainment in Prison and Treatment as common Criminals, subsequent to Proclamation of Peace.
Qs. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 12*, 573.
Harsh Treatment of in India—Reason for and Number subjected to.
Qs. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *As.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 9*, 101.

[*cont.*

Boer Prisoners—*cont.*

Harsh Treatment of, in India—*cont.*

Arrangements for Prisoners willing to sign the Conditions of Peace but unwilling to take the Oath of Allegiance.

Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 9*, 101.

Number of, at Bermuda—Circumstances of Detention — Possible Date of Return to South Africa.

Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 16*, 846.

Boilers

Water-tube and Scotch.

Os. Sir William Allan, *Mar. 16*, 949; Sir Fortescue Flannery, *Mar. 17*, 1028.

Boland, Mr. [Kerry, S.]

Irish Education — Grants — Appointment of, Equivalent to Grant for English Education under New Act—Consideration of Representations made at Dublin Educational Conference, with regard to, *Mar. 23*, 1453.

Irish Training Colleges.

Financial Aid given to—Discrimination between Denominational and Undenominational Colleges as regards Amount of Grant—Grant of Equal Privileges, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 266.

Returns relative to, Grant of, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1231.

Macedonia, Affairs in — Memoranda of Madame Bakhmetieff — Steps taken by Government to secure Copies of, Circulation to Members, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 95.

Naval Medical Department — Promotion and Pay—Improvement in respect to, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1444.

Borough Councils

Electric Light Fittings, Supply of—*Debate* [H.C.] *London County Council* [*General Powers*] *Bill*, *Mar. 28*, 1545.

Boscawen, Mr. Griffith [Kent, Tunbridge]

Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway Bill—Introduction of an instruction concerning the subsoil, *Mar. 12*, 677.

City and South London Railway Bill—Introduction of Instruction, *Mar. 12*, 680, 681.

Bosman, Mr.

Chamberlain, His interview with Mr.—

Os. Mr. Bryn Roberts, *Mar. 19*, 1290, 1291; Mr. Chamberlain, *Mar. 19*, 1290, 1291.

Bournemouth Corporation Tramways Bill

l. com. Mar. 9. 61.

Bowles, Mr. Gibson [Lynn Regis]

Aden—Operations in Hinterland under control of India Office, *Mar. 11*, 380.

Admiralty Yacht—Was tender on definite design and specification, or were Firms to submit their own designs—Adoption of similar plan for Harbours, etc., in view of obtaining alternative Designs and Specifications, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1459.

Brussels Sugar Convention.

Communication of to British Government with regard to Law, Orders and Regulations on Taxation of Sugar in Great Britain and Crown Colonies—Action with regard to Self-Governing Colonies —Meeting of Convention, *Mar. 23*, 1460.

Obligation of H.M. Government to submit Convention to British Colonies and India—Number of Colonies before which it has been submitted—their Views to be laid on Table, *Mar. 9*, 107.

Business of the House — Non-effective Votes—Inconvenience of taking Votes previous to general discussion of Navy Estimates, *Mar. 18*, 1106.

Committee of Ways and Means—Motion that it be not interrupted under Standing Order, and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed—Motion of a debatable character, alleged, *Mar. 19*, 1235.

Fleet, increase of—Committee to Report on—Names of Members of, Decision with regard to establishment of New Naval Base in Firth of Forth, *Mar. 12*, 578.

International Mercantile Marine Company —Agreement between H.M. Government and—Lines and Scope of—Violation of Merchant Shipping Act, alleged, *Mar. 23*, 1462.

Jamaica, Introduction of Bill empowering guarantee out of general revenues of Colony and payment of interest on capital expended in establishing sugar factories, Constitution of such—Payment and guarantees as direct or indirect bounties — Submission of question to Permanent Commission at Brussels, *Mar. 23*, 1460.

Marine Engineering Committee, Names of Members of — Strengthening of equipment of Board—Possible date of appointment, *Mar. 12*, 576.

Naval Cadetships for Executive Officers, etc.—Nominations to compete for entrance to "Britannia" for—Number of, by whom granted under new Scheme, *Mar. 16*, 834.

Naval Service on Royal Yacht—Practice with regard to promotion of Officers subsequent to — Continuance of practice, *Mar. 16*, 834.

[*cont.*

Bowles, Mr. Gibson—*cont.*
- Naval Training, Memorandum on—Omission of signatures of Commissioners, with exception of one—Reason for omission, *Mar. 16*, 847.
- Navy Flag List, Deficiency in Numbers of younger officers on, *Mar. 11*, 577.
- Navy—King's Regulations, Changes in—Recommendations for sanction of, by Order in Council, *Mar. 16*, 848.
- Navy — Lord Goschen's Committee—Recommendations of — Laying on Table of Report previous to discussion on Navy Estimates, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 577.
- New Army Rifle, Proposed adoption by Admiralty, Further trials of, previous to final adoption, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 379.
- Osborne Naval College, Character of—Possible relation to Dartmouth Naval College—Accommodation, etc., *Mar. 23*, 1458.
- Parliamentary Procedure.
  - New Rules, Supply to come before Bill, under, *Mar. 19*, 1234.
  - Point of order, Duty of Minister to lay on the Table documents asked for by hon. Members, provided such a course of action is conducive to public interest, *Mar. 12*, 569.
- Persia, British and Russian Influence in—Establishment of definite understanding as to action and influence of Great Britain and Russia in Persia—Communications with regard to, to be laid on Table, *Mar. 9*, 104.
- Portsmouth Harbour — Swing Bridge—Substitution of for Permanent Bridge, proposed—Steps to procure abandonment of proposal, *Mar. 9*, 100.
- Supply.
  - Army Estimates — Land Forces — Alleged Dangers to Indian Frontier from Russia —Reasons in favour of a Diminution of the Regular Forces, *Mar. 10*, 347.
    - Pay of Army—Appointment of General Truman as Inspector General of Remounts—Salary of Military Attaché, *Mar. 12*, 616.
    - Court of Inquiry on Case of General Truman, *Mar. 12*, 621.
    - Confusion in Arrangement of Estimates, *Mar. 12*, 631, 632.
  - Civil Service Estimates — Irish National Gallery — Protest against Excess Vote—Irregularities with regard to accounts, *Mar. 17*, 1003.
    - Suggested Postponement of Vote, *Mar. 17*, 1005.
    - Objection withdrawn, *Mar. 17*, 1006.

Bowles, Mr. Gibson—*cont.*
- Supply—*cont.*
  - Civil Service Estimates—*cont.*
    - Protest against Financial Irregularity Committed by Sir Walter Armstrong—Request for an Account of the Department's Intentions, *Mar. 18*, 1110.
    - Appeal for further consideration of the Question, *Mar. 18*, 1112.
  - Navy Estimates—Efficiency of the Naval Officer—Failure of recent Boards of Admiralty to deal with the Naval Problem—Duties and Capability of the Engineers—Boy Artificers—Objections to the New Scheme of Naval Training, *Mar. 16*, 882.
    - Competitive Examinations, *Mar. 16*, 920.
    - Scope of Nomination, *Mar. 16*, 935.
    - Pensions and Half-Pay, etc.—Discussion on Non-Effective Votes, *Mar. 18*, 1115.
    - United States and English Food Supply, *Mar. 23*, 1478, 1487.
    - Protest against Expenditure—Attitude of the People—Food Supply—Manning of the Navy—Mercantile Marine—Reserves—Negotiations with Foreign Powers, *Mar. 23*, 1487.
- Traction Engines on Public Roads—Accidents caused by—Steps for Protection of Public from Dangers arising from, *Mar. 10*, 262.
- Wright, Mr. Whitaker—Prosecution of—Institution of Proceedings against at Expense of Creditors—Reconsideration of Decision with regard to Public Prosecution, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 581.

Bradford Corporation Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *Mar. 10*, 237.

Braunton—North Devon
- Lighthouse—Connection of, with Braunton —Delay in commencement of work, alleged.
  - *Q.* Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 9*, 90.

Bridgewater Gas Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 79.
- *c. Com. Mar. 9*, 79.

Bridlington Piers and Harbours
- Annual general Accounts presented, *Mar. 23*, 1434, 1438.

Brighton Corporation Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 61.

Brigg, Mr. [Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley]
  Private Bill Procedure, Introduction of legislation with view to curtailing work of Private Committees and lessening expense of promoting Private Bills, *Mar. 13*, 731.

Bristol Corporation Bill
  l. com. Mar. 9, 61.

British Gas Light Company (Norwich) Bill
  l. Report,* *Mar. 12*, 520.
  *l. com**. *Mar. 19*, 1210.

Broadhurst, Mr. [Leicester]
  Innkeepers' Liability Bill — Right of Cyclists and other travellers to non-intoxicant refreshments if desired, *Mar. 6*, 12, 21.
  Supply—Army Estimates—Land Forces—Reasons in favour of a reduction —Burden on the taxpayer—Inefficient recruits—Deterioration in physique and morality, *Mar. 18*, 1153.
    Retired Pay—Reasons for debate on non-effectives—Rewards for disguished services, *Mar. 12*, 690.

Broadstairs Gas Bill
  c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 79.
  c. com. Mar. 9, 79.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. W. St. John—*Secretary of State for War* [Surrey, Guildford]
  Army Buildings on Salisbury Plain—Map showing buildings erected, or in course of construction on, to be placed in Tea Room, *Mar. 9*, 96.
  Army Corps Manœuvres — Proposed localities for, *Mar. 9*, 95.
  Army Returns.
    Condition of classification of Regulars as effective—Distinction in Army Estimates between Recruits and Effectives, proposed, *Mar.18*,1096.
    General Annual Return — Possible date of re-issuing of, *Mar. 9*, 94.
    Grant of, proposed, in respect of Volunteers, Army Reserves, Military Works, and Royal Garrison Regiments, *Mar. 9*, 96.
  Army—Strength of.
    Inclusion of men on gratuity furlough in calculation of, *Mar. 9*, 98.
    Inclusion of Militia and Volunteer Staffs in total strength of Army, *Mar. 9*, 94.
    Shown in Army Estimates, page 12, Number of Effectives of all ranks —proportion of fully trained men to total number, *Mar. 9*, 97.
    Three hundred men out of every battalion non-effective, alleged, *Mar. 9*, 98.
  Boer Prisoners of War, Deportation of, to India, Ceylon, and Bermuda — Number deported, detainment in prison and treatment as common criminals, subsequent to proclamation of peace, *Mar. 12*, 573.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. W. St. John.—*cont.*
  British Campaigns and Expeditions—Number of, during last ten years—Number of troops employed, etc., *Mar. 9*, 96.
  Cavalry—Abolition of Lance, grounds for, *Mar. 16*, 840.
    Employment of both rifle and sword—Unnecessary equipment, *Mar. 16*, 842.
  Durham Drill Hall—Contribution from Government funds towards cost of erection, proportion of, to total cost—Employment of hall for other than military purposes, *Mar. 18*, 1092.
  Estimates, Appendices to—Possible date of issue, *Mar. 20*, 1384.
    Increase of Army—Increased pay and pension schemes—Effect on non-effective Votes of the Army, *Mar. 13*, 730.
  Excess Troops, Pay of, under what Constitutional or Parliamentary Authority, *Mar. 11*, 377.
  Field Artillery Batteries at Limerick, Full equipment of, *Mar. 9*, 100.
  First Grenadier Guards—Evidence taken before Court of Inquiry — Undesirability of publication of — Grounds for refusal, *Mar. 12*, 571.
    Flogging of Drummer Boys of — Circumstances of case—Steps for prevention of recurrence, *Mar. 16*, 841.
    Flogging of Drummer Boy—Circumstances attending occurrence — Means for prevention of practice, *Mar. 23*, 1454.
    Mock Courts-Martial — Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed — Evidence taken before Court of Inquiry, demanded, *Mar 12*, 569.
  Flogging of Drummer Boys—Breach of King's Regulations with regard to—Laying on Table of Evidence, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 572.
  Guard Rooms—Improved Sleeping Accommodation in, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1221.
  Horses for the Army — Conditions of Classification of Horses as Effective—Distinction in Army Estimates between Remount and Effective Horses, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1096.
  Indian Army—Reliefs for—Date of Embarkation of, *Mar. 17*, 994.
  Lance Practice, Withdrawal of, from Course of Training—Deprivation of Men of Lancer Regiments of Extra Pay for Increased Efficiency, *Mar. 17*, 996.
  Lance *v.* Sword—Substitution of Lance for Sword in Lancers, Dragoon Guards and Dragoon Regiments — Reconsideration of, proposed—Issue of Order with reference to, on approval of Inspector-General of Cavalry, *Mar. 12*, 576.

[*cont.*

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. W. St. John—*cont.*

Lancers—Prizes for Lance Practice—Discontinuance of, *Mar. 12*, 576.

Lough Swilly—Improvement of Boat Slips on, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1093.

Malta—Soldiers' Club at, Revival of—Provision of Suitable Accommodation for—Management of, *Mar. 9*, 95.

Meat Contracts—Substitution of Foreign for Home Grown Meat, alleged—Wording of Contract relating to Regulations with regard to kind of Meat, *Mar. 18*, 1094.

Terms of Contracts—Alteration of, with view to rendering Terms more definite, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1453.

Military Works Act—Expenditure for Year ending March 31st, 1903, *Mar. 23*, 1454.

Military Works Bill—Possible Introduction during present Session—Amount to be borrowed under, *Mar. 16*, 841.

Officers.

Officers Compulsory Retired—Circumstances of Retirement—Number of Officers placed on Half-Pay—Similar Details for Militia and Volunteers, requested, *Mar. 18*, 1094.

Education of Officers—Inclusion of Provision in New Regulations with regard to Promotion of Qualified Non-Commissioned Officers to Commissioned Rank, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 568.

Expenses of Officers—Reduction of, thus enabling Officers to meet expenses without recourse to private means, *Mar. 9*, 97.

Officers of Militia, Yeomanry, Volunteers, Number of, holding "Q" and "T" Certificates, respectively, *Mar. 18*, 1095.

Officers on Half-Pay eligible for re-employment, Number of, compulsorily placed on Half-Pay list, Possible re-employment of, *Mar. 18*, 1095.

Officers on Half-Pay, Increase of, in 1903–4, compared with 1902–3—Explanation requested, *Mar. 17*, 995.

Officers on Half-Pay—Totals for Half-Pay required for Officers eligible for employment, percentage of sums—also that of Non-Effective Vote to Army Estimates, *Mar. 16*, 840.

Officers' Removal — Charges against the Commander-in-Chief, *Mar. 11*, 479.

Protest against personal attacks and insinuations against the Headquarters Staff of the Army, *Mar. 11*, 495, 496, 497, 498.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. W. St. John—*cont.*

Officers—*cont.*

Officers' Removal—*cont.*

Justification of the Treatment of Colonel Kinloch, *Mar. 11*, 500.

Reasons against Courts-Martial in Special Cases, *Mar. 11*, 508.

Case of Colonel Burroughs, *Mar. 11*, 508.

Veterinary Officers — Pay, Improvements in, Possible date of introducing, *Mar. 18*, 1097.

Volunteers — Officers' Resignations, Number of, since May, 1902, *Mar. 6*, 8.

Parliamentary Procedure, Point of Order, Duty of Minister to lay on the Table Documents asked for by honourable Members, provided such a course of action is conducive to public interest, *Mar. 12*, 570.

Personal Explanation with regard to misrepresentation of Lord Belhaven in connection with Grenadier Guards' scandal, *Mar. 9*, 99.

Questions in the House—Questions relative to the province of the Secretary of State for War answered by representative of Colonial Office, *Mar. 11*, 377; *Mar. 12*, 574.

Recruiting.

Rejections on account of Defective Teeth, percentage of, during present year, *Mar. 18*, 1093.

Transfer of Recruit from Militia to Army, Inclusion of in number of both Militia and Army, thus reckoning one recruit as two, *Mar. 9*, 98.

Remount Department—Employment of Retired Officers of Veterinary Department as Purchasing Officers in, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1097.

Reservists, Number of, in receipt of Pay—Number not in receipt of Messing Allowance, *Mar. 9*, 93.

Royal Artillery Commissions, University Candidates for — Standard required, Method of selection, *Mar. 23*, 1454.

Sandhurst Military College—Expenses of Second Year's Training of, Defrayed by parents or State, *Mar. 20*, 1384.

Sanitary Inspection, Exemption of Government property from—Grounds for, *Mar. 23*, 1439.

Somaliland—Alleged object of campaign —to give prominent share to Somali levies — foundation for statement, *Mar. 12*, 575.

Somaliland, Map of, in Tea Room of House, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1454.

South African War Medals — American Nurses on Hospital Ship "Maine"—Refusal of, to female nurses—Grounds for refusal, *Mar. 19*, 1221.

[*cont.*

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. W. St. John—*cont.*

South African War Medals—King's Medals—Conditions of eligibility for—Apparent inconsistency of awards—Possible date of distribution, *Mar. 16*, 842.

Staff Service — Medical examination of officers previous to appointments on Staff, and compulsory return to regimental duty after five years' Staff service — Exceptions to regulations, *Mar. 17*, 996.

Supply — Army Estimates — Training of Officers—Deficiencies in general and military education of army candidates—Proposed Committee for settlement of examination syllabus—Scope of examination—Development of Sandhurst — Open-air experience for military cadets—University men in the army — Question of suspending inefficient officers—Practical field training—Qualifications for promotion and promotion examinations—Confidential reports—Provision of adequate manœuvring grounds, etc., *Mar. 9*, 132.

Volunteer Organisation—Justification for the Commission—Question of compulsory camps—Advantage of military training — Addition to allowances, *Mar. 9*, 188, 228.

Land Forces—Answers to criticism—Justification for increase in numbers of the Regular forces and consequent increase of expenditure — Value of the Auxiliary Forces — Alleged Starving of the Intelligence Department—The state of the War Office — Improved Organisation of Army Medical Department — Medical Staff College established in London —Defence of the Remount Department—Question of the excess of officers' expenses over their pay—Reduction of expenditure in Cavalry regiments—Outlay on improved guns, *Mar. 10*, 294.

Army Corps Scheme, *Mar. 11*, 422, 426.

Proposed reduction in Number, *Mar. 11*, 422.

Connexion of Army and Navy, *Mar. 11*, 427.

Increas of Expenditure, *Mar. 12*, 596.

Amalgamation of Militia and Reserve, *Mar. 12*, 597, 598.

Salaries of Army Corps Officers, *Mar. 12*, 616.

Case of General Truman, *Mar. 12*, 621, 625.

Application of Army Corps Scheme to Scotland, *Mar. 12*, 629, 630.

Arrangement of the Estimates, *Mar. 12*, 632.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. W. St. John—*cont.*

Supply—*cont.*

Reasons for increase in Number of Officers on half-pay—Rewards for Distinguished Service, *Mar. 12*, 686.

Non-effective Vote, *Mar. 12*, 688.

Colonels and other Officers on half-pay, *Mar. 12*, 698.

Question of authority for statements made, *Mar. 18*, 1128.

Specials in the Army, *Mar. 18*, 1129.

Reservists and men on furlough, *Mar. 18*, 1137.

Defence of South African battalions—Indian Service—Total Strength of the Army—Question of inefficient recruits —Payment of inefficients—Answers to criticism, etc., *Mar. 18*, 1143.

Age of recruits, *Mar. 18*, 1162.

Pay, Allowances, etc.—Reasons for increase in Staff, *Mar. 18*, 1169.

Reasons for increase in Number of Officers on full-pay, *Mar. 18*, 1171.

Volunteers, Artillery, Training of—Consideration of application from corps trained as Mobile Artillery, for continuance as such under same conditions as Imperial Yeomanry, *Mar. 23*, 1453.

Volunteers—Recruiting Statistics, *Mar. 18*, 1093.

Volunteers' Bandoliers—Unsuitability of those Employed during South African War—Issue of suitable equipment, *Mar. 16*, 839.

Waltham Abbey Sanitary Inspection—Exemptions of Government property from—Grounds for, *Mar. 23*, 1439.

West Yorkshire Artillery Volunteers—Order with regard to number of horses to be employed during annual Training — Recission of order, proposed, *Mar. 16*, 840.

Brunner, Sir John [Cheshire, Northwich]

Supply—Army Estimates—Land Forces—Importance of ascertaining Age of Recruits, *Mar. 18*, 1162.

Brussels Sugar Convention

Communication of British Government to, with regard to Law, Orders and Regulations on Taxation of Sugar in Great Britain and Crown Colonies—Action with regard to Self-Governing Colonies —Meeting of Convention.

Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 23*, 1460.

Obligation of H. M. Government to submit Convention to British Colonies and India—Number of Colonies before which it has been submitted—their Views to be laid on Table.

Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 9*, 107.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J. [Aberdeen, S.]
Business of the House—Possible date of Rising for Easter Recess, *Mar. 19*, 1232.
Dublin University—Women's Degrees—Application for Power to Confer Degrees upon Women — Result of Request, *Mar. 17*, 993.
Supply.
Colonial Vote—Reasons for Immediate Discussion on the Vote—Information desired on Native Labour, on Taxation of the Natives, on Loans, and on the General Financial Position in South Africa, *Mar. 19*, 1240.
South African Loans, *Mar. 19*, 1244.
Land Settlement, *Mar. 19*, 1244.
Education Vote—Action of the Board of Education — Circulars regarding Voluntary Schools—Necessity for Guidance of the Local Authority from the Board of Education, *Mar. 19*, 1380.
Physical Training Committee, *Mar. 19*, 1328.
Civil Service Estimates—Request for Information concerning the Government Policy with regard to Affairs in Macedonia and Bulgaria—Behaviour of the Bulgarian Government—Albanian Outrages — Necessity for Stronger Pressure on the Turkish Government, *Mar. 23*, 1563.
Bulgarians in Macedonia, *Mar. 23*, 1571.

Buchanan, Mr. [Perthshire, E.]
Indian Army—Pay, Increase of to British Troops — Effect on Indian Budget, *Mar. 19*, 1221.
Licensing in Scotland—Number of Burghs losing Licensing Jurisdiction under New Licensing Bill, *Mar. 9*, 87.
Military Works Act—Expenditure for year ending 31st March, 1903, *Mar. 23*, 1454.
Military Works Bill—Possible Introduction during present Session—Amount to be borrowed under, *Mar. 16*, 841.
Naval Works Act—Expenditure under, for year ending 31st March, 1903, *Mar. 23*, 1445.
Naval Works Bill—Possible introduction of, during present Session—Amount to be borrowed under, *Mar. 16*, 847.
Supply.
Army Estimates—Pay, Allowances, etc.—Military Services in Colonies and Egypt, *Mar. 18*, 1169.

Buchanan, Mr.—*cont.*
Supply—*cont.*
Navy Estimates—Suggested Report of Progress, *Mar. 16*, 987.
Salaries of Officers, Men and Boys—Appeal for Defence or Explanation of the Enormous Expenditure — Outlay on Naval Works — Creation of New Dockyard and Naval Base — Increase in Works Vote—Appeal to the Government to Control Expenditure, *Mar. 17*, 1007.
Pensions, Half-pay, etc.—Question of Automatic Votes and Control of the House, *Mar. 18*, 1115.
Winter, Captain—Case of—Possible Action of Authorities with regard to Captain Winter, under Conviction for Assaulting Natives, *Mar. 23*, 1450.
Budget—Date of Introduction.
Qs. Sir G. Bartley, Mr. Buchanan; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 19*, 1232.

Building Societies
Report Presented, *Mar. 9*, 63, 81.

Bulgaria
Macedonian Affairs, Position with Regard to.
Os. Lord Newton, *Mar. 13*, 707; Lord Bishop of Hereford, *Mar. 13*,713; Marquess of Lansdowne, *Mar. 13*, 718; Earl Spencer, *Mar. 13*, 722.
Condition of Affairs.
Os. Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 23*, 1563; Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 23*, 1569; Mr. Stevenson, *Mar. 23*, 1575.

Bull, Mr. [Hammersmith]
Serpentine—Cleaning of, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 563.

Buller, General
Military Cases in House of Commons—Question of Discussing.
O. Mr. Pirie, *Mar. 11*, 478.

Burdett-Coutts, Mr. [Westminster]
London County Council (General Powers) Bill—Supply of Electric Light Fittings by Borough Councils, *Mar. 23*, 1554.

Burgess Hill and St. John's Common Gas Bill
c. 2R.* *com.*, *Mar. 10*, 251.

Burghclere, Lord
Education Act—Schemes under, Number of, Providing for Appointment of Persons Nominated or Recommended by the Free Church Council, Policy of Board in Dealing with such Schemes, *Mar. 20*, 1376.
Prevention of Corruption Bill—Distinction between "Corrupt" Commissions, and others, *Mar. 10*, 241.
Shops (Early Closing) Bill—Attitude of Shopkeepers, *Mar. 20*, 1356.
Authority for London, *Mar. 20*, 1366.

Burke, Mr. Haviland [King's County, Tullamore]

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturdays (Ireland) Bill—Objection to Bill as an Encouragement of Shebeening and Home Drinking — Drunkenness in Ireland, *Mar. 6*, 49.

Burns, Mr. John [Battersea]

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill—Reasons against 2R.—Advisability of Postponement pending the Decision of the Royal Commission, *Mar. 11*, 472.

City and N. E. Suburban Electric Railway Bill—Reason for Rejection of Bill—Necessity for amalgamation and co-ordination of existing railway systems, without creation of new lines in the interest of American speculators—Work of the Royal Commission, *Mar. 12*, 665.

City and South London Railway Bill—Instruction concerning sub-soil, *Mar. 12*, 681.

London County Council (General Powers(Bill—Supply of electric lights and fittings—Borough Councils in competition with retail dealers — Installation of electricity in churches and chapels —Instructions to Committee, *Mar. 23*, 1547.

London United Tramways Bill (By order) —Reasons in favour of, 2R., *Mar. 19*, 1306.

Municipal Trading—Reports in proof of the efficiency of municipalities—Objections to proposed inquiry—Benefits derived from municipal trading in gas, tramways, etc. — Case of the Manchester Ship Canal, *Mar. 16*, 979.

Supply—Education Vote—Protest against the imposition of Military Drill in elementary schools—Reasons in favour of Swiss or Swedish Drills, *Mar. 19*, 1303, 1310.

Burroughes, Colonel

Military Cases, Question of Courts-Martial for.

Os. Mr. Bromley-Davenport, *Mar. 11*, 489; Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 11*, 508.

Bury and District Joint Water Board Bill

l. com., *Mar. 9*, 61.

Business of the House

Contradiction between Statements made with regard to, alleged.

Q. Sir. C. Dilke; *A.* Sir A. Acland-Hood, *Mar. 18*, 1106.

Course of Business.

Misunderstanding with regard to Mr. A. J. Balfour's Statements, *Mar. 18*, 1108.

Mr. A. J. Balfour's Statements and Replies to Questions, *Mar. 16*, 859; *Mar. 19*, 1232.

Mr. Ritchie's Statements, *Mar. 23*, 1470.

Business of the House—*cont.*

Irish Land Bill—Week's Notice of Introduction requested.

Qs. Mr. Redmond; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 10*, 267.

Non-effective Votes—Inconvenience of taking previous to general discussion of Navy Estimates, *Mar. 18*, 1106.

Caerleon

Antiquities at.

O. Sir J. Lawrence, *Mar. 10*, 358.

Caine, The late Mr. W. S. [Cornwall, Camborne]

Delhi Durbar—Omission of grant of boon or concession on occasion of—Steps to rectify omission, *Mar. 16*, 833.

Caldwell, Mr. James [Lanarkshire, Mid]

Forth-Clyde Canal, Consideration of Proposal by Defence Committee, *Mar. 11*, 388.

Local Government (Transfer of Boards) Bill, *Mar. 9*, 236.

School Board Electorate (Scotland) Bill—Reasons for Extension of the School Board Franchise, *Mar. 18*, 1205.

Supply.

Civil Service and Revenue Departments—Estimates—Time of Vote, *Mar. 23*, 1518.

Navy Estimates—Grievances of Scotland—Necessity for a Naval Base —Importance of a Canal to connect seas of Forth and Clyde, *Mar. 16*, 968.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. [Stirling Burghs]

Business of the House—Course of business with regard to Estimates, *Mar. 23*, 1470.

Supply.

Army Estimates.

Land Forces—Defence of Indian Frontier—Deficiencies in recruiting system—Question of linked battalions — Protest against excessive expenditure with adequate return—Unnecessary size of Regular Forces—Organisation at the War Office — Principle of Decentralisation — Expenses of officers, *Mar. 10*, 314; *Mar. 11*, 443.

Defence of Indian Frontier, *Mar. 11*, 456.

Relative Positions of Army and Navy, *Mar. 11*, 465.

Motion to go into Committee—Protest against curtailment of debate, *Mar. 10*, 293.

[*cont.*

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—*cont.*
- Supply—*cont.*
  - Army Estimates—*cont.*
    - Report of the Education Committee—Training of Officers after attaining the rank of Officers — Objections to the old purchase system — Entrance of officers—Expenses of Cavalry Regiments—Commissions given to the ranks, *Mar. 9*, 145.
    - Retired Pay—Protest against the action of the Government in taking Vote at the time, *Mar. 12*, 689; the taking of non-effectives, *Mar. 12*, 692.
    - Navy Estimates — Reasons for opposition to the scheme of training proposed by the Admiralty—Objections to exclusiveness of the scheme—Expense incurred, *Mar. 16*, 938.

Camperdown, Earl of
- Shops (Hours of Closing) Bill—Question of adjournment in favour of Lord Avebury's Early Closing Bill, *Mar. 12*, 539, 540.

Canada
- Naval Reserve—Establishment of, independent of Imperial Authority — Action of British Government.
  - *Q.* Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 17*, 996.

Canterbury, the Lord Archbishop of
- Shops (Early Closing) Bill.
  - Bill in interests of small shopkeepers —Education and self-improvement prevented by long hours of work in shops—Appeal for 2R. of bill, *Mar. 12*, 549.
  - Initiative of Shopkeepers, *Mar. 20*, 1355.
  - Report of Select Committee, *Mar. 20*, 1361.

Carmarthenshire Electric Power Bill
- *l. com. Mar. 9*, 61.

Carrington, Earl
- Militia Ballot Bill—Number of Officers short in the Militia, *Mar. 13*, 726.

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir. E. H., *Solicitor-General*—[Dublin University]
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturdays (Ireland) Bill — Reasons for Earlier Closing of Public Houses on Saturdays, *Mar. 6*, 49.

Cecil, Lord Hugh [Greenwich]
- Army Officers' Removal—Point of Order, *Mar. 11*, 501.

Cecil, Lord Hugh—*cont.*
- Church Discipline Bill—Question of Royal Supremacy in Scotland, *Mar. 13*, 757.
  - Protestant Doctrine, *Mar. 13*, 777.
  - Bishops' Veto, *Mar. 13*, 784.
- Supply.
  - Army Estimates.
    - Land Forces—Gain in Military Efficiency and National Economy by Reduction of the Army, *Mar. 18*, 1158.
      - Relative Positions of Army and Navy—Power of the Navy to Defend England in case of Invasion and to render large Regular Forces unnecessary — Plea to the Government for Judicious Economy, *Mar. 11*, 461.
    - Retired Pay — Non-effectives, *Mar. 12*, 692.

Cecil, Mr. Evelyn [Aston Manor]
- British and Colonial Trade—Harm incurred by British Trade through Commercial and Fiscal Policies of other Countries—Necessity for a Council of Commercial Defence, for Amendment of the Board of Trade Regulations, for Through Preferential Rates, and for Reciprocal Reservation of the British Coasting Trade, *Mar. 17*, 1074.

Ceylon
- Boer Prisoners.
  - Number of, having refused to take Oath of Allegiance—Ill-treatment of, alleged — Possible Date of Return to South Africa.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Swift MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 11*, 375.
  - Number Deported, Detainment in Prison and Treatment as Common Criminals, Subsequent to Proclamation of Peace.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Swift MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 12*, 573.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Austen—*Postmaster-General* [Worcestershire, East]
- Boer Prisoners.
  - Ceylon, detention of in, Number detained having refused to take Oath of Allegiance—Ill-treatment of, alleged—Possible date of return to South Africa, *Mar. 11*, 375.
  - India—Arrangements for prisoners willing to sign the conditions of peace, but unwilling to take the oath of allegiance, *Mar. 9*, 101.
- Ireland.
  - Ballinhassig Post Office, Inconvenient situation of, Unsatisfactory appointment to postmastership, alleged — Remedy of alleged grievance, proposed, *Mar. 16*, 857.

[*cont.*

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Austen—*cont.*
  Ireland—*cont.*
    Castletown Postmistress, Appointment of — Person responsible for, *Mar. 12*, 588.
    Dublin Sorting Office.
      Promotion of second division clerk to first class assistant superintendent, contrary to usual practice—Grounds for, *Mar. 16*, 856.
      Pay previous to promotion and present salary — Length of service, etc., of those passed over by promoted officers, *Mar. 23*, 1469.
      Sorters' Duties — Withdrawal of 7s. allowanced sorting postmen from certain duties, alleged, Provision of assistants to do their work, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 373.
      Sorter-tracers' vacancies filled by transfers, alleged — Reservation of number of vacancies for postmen's competition, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 373.
    Kilkenny Post Office, Non-delivery of letters on Sunday—Arrangements for Sunday delivery and collection, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 565.
    Limerick Post Office, Postal and Telegraph Staffs' Grievances, Record of Irregularities committed by, and consideration of in connection with granting of annual increments, alleged, *Mar. 9*, 113.
    Limerick Post Office, Vacancy for Assistant Superintendentship, Promotion of local official, *Mar. 9*, 113.
    Lurgan Post Office, Possible date of erection of, *Mar. 16*, 838.
    Telegraphic errors involving loss to Merchants — Compensation for, *Mar. 10*, 262.
  Post Office.
    Dewsbury Post Office, Improved Sanitary Accommodation, Action with regard to acquirement of new premises, in view of overcrowding at present premises, *Mar. 23*, 1439.
    Ex-Banbridge Postmaster, Restoration of, Present appointment, Circumstances of restoration, *Mar. 12*, 589.
    Liverpool Post Office—Female Staff—Salaries, Inadequacy of, alleged, *Mar. 12*, 564.
    Manchester Post Office—Dissatisfaction arising from Promotion of Allowance Holders to Head Postmen's Class, to the Disregard of Seniors in the Service, *Mar. 9*, 108.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Austen—*cont.*
  Post Office—*cont.*
    Postal Officials as Candidates for Parliament—Extension of Privilege enjoyed by Military and Naval Officers, of being placed on half-pay for purpose of seeking Election in Parliament, to Postal Officials, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1229.
    Postal Order System—Extension to Colonies, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1104.
    Postal Rates.
      Advisability of securing Advantages enjoyed by European Nations for English Commercial Firms, proposed, *Mar. 17*, 999; *Mar. 19*, 1219.
      Low Rates in Germany—Arrangements for placing British Merchants on equal footing with Germans, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1219.
      Reduction of, to United States, proposed — Re-opening of Negotiations with United States Government, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 261.
    Return of Post Offices on Licensed Premises, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1230.
    Savings Bank, Removal of to West Kensington, necessitating appointment of Telegraph Staff—System of Promotion to New Appointments, *Mar. 10*, 258.
    Scotch Mail Service—Mail Steamer "St. Clair"—Omission to leave Scalloway at stated time and to carry Mails—Delay in Delivery of Mails at Lerwick, alleged, *Mar. 10*, 257.
    Wages, Low Rate of—Statement of Mr. Justice Phillimors—Possible Action for Improvement of, *Mar. 19*, 1229.
  South Africa.
    South African Constabulary—Loss of Kit in South African War, Compensation for, *Mar. 6*, 7.
    Transport of Stores to South Africa—Negotiations with Companies violating Fair Wage Resolution, alleged—Employment of British Seamen in preference to foreigners, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 579.
    Transvaal—Labour Ordinances—Lay on Table of all Ordinances relating to Employment of Black and White Labour—Changes effected in regulations subsequent to Annexation of Transvaal, etc., proposed, *Mar. 12*, 579.
    Transvaal Mines — Employment of Natives in—Statistics of Mortality, Sickness, Desertion, etc., *Mar. 9*, 102.

[*cont.*

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Austen—*cont.*
Telegraphic Service.
Conditions of Service—Reference of matters relating to, to Members of Parliament, *Mar. 12*, 564.
Devonport—Decision with regard to request for improved service, *Mar. 12*, 563.
London Appointments—Ground for appointment of two female technical Officers in preference to Seniors possessing equal technical qualifications, *Mar. 23*, 1464.
Orkney — Severance of tetegraphic communication with Westray, Orkney—Efforts for speedy restoration of, *Mar. 11*, 373.
West African Railways.
Construction of—Payment of Commission to Shelford and Son, *Mar. 6*, 5.
Uganda Railway — Crown Agent's Commission — Allocation of, to what purpose, *Mar. 6*, 5.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Joseph— *Secretary of State for the Colonies* [Birmingham, West].
Alaska.
Boundary Convention, Aim of, *Mar. 23*, 1459.
Boundary Tribunal—Official Nomination of Commissioners on, *Mar. 18*, 1098.
Boer Prisoners in Ceylon, India, and Bermuda—Detention and ill-treatment of, subsequent to conclusion of peace—on whose authority—Possible date of return to South Africa, *Mar. 16*, 844, 845, 846.
British South Africa—Forced Labour—Establishment of system of, alleged—Possible Steps for Removal of Abuse, *Mar. 23*, 1440.
Cyprus, Taxation in—Petition of Members of Legislative Council, for Relief from heaviness of, *Mar. 18*, 1101.
Jamaica—Introduction of Bill empowering Guarantee out of General Revenues of Colony and Payment of Interest on Capital expended in establishing Sugar Factories—Constitution of such Payment and Guarantees as Direct or Indirect Bounties — Submission of Question to Permanent Commission at Brussels, *Mar. 23*, 1460.
South Africa.
Cape Rebels, Amnesty of—Decision with regard to, *Mar. 16*, 846.
Contracts for Agricultural Implements for South Africa—Proportion of, given to British and Foreign Tenderers, respectively, *Mar. 20*, 1385.
Native Labour Question—Conference of South African Colonies on—Nature of, and Representation of Transvaal and Orange River Colonies and Protectorates, *Mar. 19*, 1223.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Joseph—*cont.*
South Africa—*cont.*
Native Taxation—Proposed Increase in Rate of—Comparison of Tax under British and Transvaal Governments, Opportunity for Discussion of Tax, requested, *Mar. 18*, 1098.
Pretoria Education Ordinance — Increase in Number of Hours Reserved for Instruction in Dutch above those prescribed in Ordinance, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1098.
Shipping Ring — Invitations for Tenders from Firms outside Shipping Conference—Names of Firms so Invited—Disqualification of City Agents from Shipping by Conference and outside Lines, *Mar. 19*, 1224.
South African Mission—Possible Date of Presentation to Parliament of Accurate Report of Statements made at Meetings and Interviews, during Mission, *Mar. 16*, 843.
Transvaal War Contribution—Despatch from Lord Milner on subject of—Presentation of Correspondence, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1100.
Vryheid—Addition of, to Colony of Natal, alleged — Necessity of having sanction of Imperial Parliament previous to such addition, *Mar. 16*, 847.
War Losses, Grants for—Amount and in what way expended, *Mar. 18*, 1100.
Supply.
Civil Service Estimates—Gold-mining claims and native labourers in South Africa, *Mar. 23*, 1532.
Colonial Vote—Reasons for precedence of the Vote — Decisions respecting native labour in South Africa, *Mar. 19*, 1242.
Arrangement for South African loan, *Mar. 18*, 1244.
Land Settlement Question—Compensation under the Terms of Peace — Co-operation of the Boers, *Mar. 19*, 1244, 1248.
Question of language and education, *Mar. 19*, 1249.
Deputations from working classes, *Mar. 19*, 1252, 1262.
Statistics of Compensation, etc., *Mar. 19*, 1260, 1261.
South African Constabulary, *Mar. 19*, 1260.
Establishment of elective municipalities and a Legislative Council—Concession of full self - government — Forced labour and taxation, etc., *Mar. 19*, 1271.
Information with respect to Legislative Council, *Mar. 19*, 1290.
Interview with Mr. Bosman, *Mar. 19*, 1291.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Joseph—*cont.*
West Indies Relief Fund—Distribution of, Amount allocated to each Colony—Principle of distribution, *Mar.* *19*, 1225.

Channing, Mr. Francis A. [Northampton, East]
Corruption Bill, Prevention of—Expediency of pressing forward Bill, *Mar. 11*, 389.
Congo Free State—Reports of illegal punishments inflicted upon natives by officials—Presentation of to Parliament and representations to Belgian Government, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 381.

Chapman, Mr. [Cheshire, Hyde]
Machinery Rating Bill—Reasons in favour of relieving small industries from taxation—Tyne Boiler Case—Assessment of machinery in Scotland—Report of the Commission on local taxation—Appeal for, 2R. *Mar. 20*, 1385.
Sir Henry Fowler's Bill, *Mar. 20*, 1390.
Answers to criticism, *Mar. 20*, 1391, 1416.

Chard Corporation Gas and Electricity Bill
l. com. Mar. 9, 61.
l. Report,* *Mar. 12*, 520.
l. com. Mar. 19*, 1209.

Charities
Lancashire, County of—Returns presented, *Mar. 12*, 560.
Montgomery, County of—Returns Presented, *Mar. 6*, 4.

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill
Report Presented, *Mar. 23*, 1438.

Chatham and District Light Railways Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 16*, 809.
l. com. Mar. 23, 1433.

Chatham Dockyard
Private Footpaths—Reservation of for use of officers only—Removal of order previous to, and replacement of subsequent to visit of First Lord, alleged.
Q. Mr. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 23*, 1443.

China
Anti-Foreign Feeling—Official reports from Tientsin and Manchuria regarding Government Measures.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 9*, 105.
Anti-Foreign Rising—Grant of International Medal to Allied Forces in China, proposed.
Q. Mr. Kearley; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 12*, 562.
British Railway Concessions—Number of miles of—British Railways in construction—Action of Government with regard to.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 9*, 102.

China—*cont.*
Expeditionary Force, Vote for.
Os. Mr. George Whiteley, *Mar. 18*, 1167; Lord Stanley, *Mar. 18*, 1168.
Provisional Rules defining respective jurisdiction of Mixed Courts of International and French Settlements at Shanghai, *Mar. 19*, 1210.
Wuchang Viceroy—Reinstatement of Chang-Chih-Tung.—Influence of British Government to secure, in recognition of services rendered to foreigners during Boxer Rising.
Q. Mr. J. Walton; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 9*, 103.

Church
Intrusive Patronage in North Wales.
Q. Lord Stanley of Alderley, *Mar. 9*, 63; *A.* Earl Stanhope, *Mar. 9*, 73.

Church Discipline
Applications for Prosecutions for Illegal Practices—Return of, during last ten years.
Q. Mr. Cubitt; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 6*, 5.

Church Discipline Bill
Debate [H.C.] *on* 2R. *Mar. 13*, 733.
Petition against, presented, *Mar. 13*, 729; *Mar. 18*, 1086.

Church Estimates Commission
Report presented, *Mar. 9*, 63, 80.

Churchill, Mr. Winston [Oldham]
Army Officers' Removal—Objections to Procedure in Military Cases—Protest against Arbitrary Decisions of the Government—Case of Colonel Kinloch, *Mar. 11*, 509.
Army Returns, in respect of Volunteers, Army Reserves, Military Works and Royal Garrison Regiments, Grant of, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 96.
Supply—Army Estimates—Pay of Army—Increasing Expenditure and Diminishing Return—Cost of Militia and of War Office General Staff—Reduction of Intelligence Department—Inevitable Reduction of the Reserve—Examination of Recruiting Statistics—Effect of Increased Pay on Recruiting—Appeal to the Secretary of State for War for reconsideration and moderation of his Army Scheme, *Mar. 12*, 591.
Army Corps Scheme, *Mar. 12*, 630, 631.
Land Forces—No European necessity for the British Army, *Mar. 18*, 1141.
Question of Reduction, *Mar. 18*, 1144.

Civil Service
Clerks in War Office—Returns, relative to, requested.
Qs. Mr. Flavin; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 23*, 1456.
Clerks receiving Maximum Salary, etc.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hayes Fisher, *Mar. 16*, 837.
Senior Assistant Clerks—Promotion of.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. Hayes Fisher, *Mar. 17*, 992.

Civil Service Estimates
Excess Votes—National Gallery of Ireland, £77 15s. 5d., *Mar. 17*, 1003.
Vote on Account, £20,265,000, *Mar. 19*, 1236; *Mar. 23*, 1514, 1555.

Clancy, Mr.
North Dublin Fisheries—Injury done to, by Trawlers, Inquiry into Circumstances, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1468.

Cleveland and Durham County Electric Power Bill
l. Report*, *Mar. 12*, 520.
Report, *com.*, *Mar. 23*, 1433.

Clubs
Illicit Drinking in Irish Shebeens.
Os. Mr. Nannetti, *Mar. 6*, 35; Major Jameson, *Mar. 6*, 42; Mr. T. W. Russell, *Mar. 6*, 46; Mr. Redmond, *Mar. 6*, 49; Mr. Haviland Burke, *Mar. 6*, 50; Mr. Flavin, *Mar. 6*, 52.
Number registered under Licensing Act.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 16*, 851.

Coaling Stations
Tripoli, Coaling Stations at—Statement with regard to establishment of, made in Italian Chamber. Assurances of British Government to the contrary.
Q. Mr. Labouchere; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 23*, 1452.

Coastguard Signal Stations
Names of Stations at present and about to be fitted with wireless telegraphy apparatus.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 23*, 1457.

Cochrane, Mr.—*Under Secretary of State for Home Department* [Ayrshire, N.]
Innkeeper's Liability Bill—Reasons for the supply of reasonable refreshments by innkeepers—Brewster Sessions—Responsibility of the innkeeper, *Mar. 6*, 17.
Licensed Premises—Internal Communication, definition of, as occurring in Licensing Act, *Mar. 23*, 1464.

"Cockchafer"
Date of purchase, price paid, cost of maintenance.
Q. Mr. Kearley; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 10*, 261.

Coghill, Mr. Douglas H. [Stoke-upon-Trent]
Smallpox in Liverpool—Number of cases, *Mar. 10*, 265.

Cohen, Mr. [Islington, E.]
City and South London Railway Bill—Instruction concerning subsoil, *Mar. 12*, 680.

Colomb, Sir John [Great Yarmouth]
Irish Land Conference—Printing and circulation of papers dealing with Land Conference and Resolution and Statement on Irish Land Purchase of Landlords' Convention, *Mar. 9*, 93.
Supply—Navy Estimates—Committee of Defence—Changes in Maritime Warfare—Connection of Naval Efficiency with the Local Supply—Policy with regard to the *personnel* of the Navy, *Mar. 23*, 1503.
Salaries of Officers, etc.—Point of Order, *Mar. 17*, 1011.
Colonial Contributions, *Mar. 17*, 1021.
Contribution of the Colonies to Imperial Expenditure—Defence of the Admiralty Scheme—Engineering work—Promotion of Warrant Officers, *Mar. 17*, 1015.

Colston, Mr. C. E. [Gloucester, Thornbury]
Guard Rooms—Improved sleeping accomodation in, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1221.
Public House Licences, Transfers—Refusal to grant a second transfer until expiration of a fixed period, *Mar. 17*, 991.

Commercial Gas Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 79.
c. com. Mar. 9, 79.

Commissions
List of subjects under investigation by, at present time.
Q. Mr. Norman; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 19*, 1222.

Committee of Imperial Defence
Submission of Constitution and Powers of, to War Inquiry Commission.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 16*, 857.

Compton, Lord Alwyne [Bedfordshire, Biggleswade]
Supply—Army Estimates—Retired Pay—Protest against the Motion to report Progress, *Mar. 12*, 691.

Congo Free State
Exclusive Territorial Concessions, Question of.
Os. Mr. C. McArthur, *Mar. 17*, 1072; Mr. Emmott, *Mar. 17*, 1080.

[*cont.*

Congo Free State—*cont.*

Reports of Illegal Punishments inflicted upon Natives by Officials—Presentation of to Parliament and representations to Belgian Government, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Channing, Mr. H. Roberts; *As.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 11*, 381; *Mar. 16*, 836.

Slavery—Official Reports with regard to, alleged—Slavery in. Enforcement of regulations of Berlin Conference, proposed.
Q. Mr. Mansfield; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 11*, 381.

Consolidated Fund No. 1 Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 23*, 1576.

Contracts

Agricultural Implements for South Africa—Proportion of Contracts given to British and Foreign Tenderers respectively.
Q. Mr. Norman; *A.* Mr. Chamberlain, *Mar. 20*, 1385.

Meat Contracts—Substitution of Foreign for Home-grown Meat, alleged—Wording of contract relating to regulations with regard to kind of meat.
Q. Mr. A. Davies; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1094; *Mar. 23*, 1453.

Contracts (India Office) Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 16*, *861*.

Corkett, Mr. A. C. [Glasgow, Tradeston]
Consumption in Scotland—Provision for Treatment of Consumption as an Infectious Disease by Local Authorities, *Mar. 16*, 837.

Cork

Assizes, Opening of on St. Patrick's Day—Postponement of, proposed.
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 16*, 854.

Corn Tax

Export of Offals, Increase in, Subsequent to Re-imposition of Corn Tax.
Q. Sir E. Straker; *A.* Mr. Richie, *Mar. 23*, 1463.

Number of Articles made liable to Customs Duties under—Number of Prosecutions for Smuggling such articles—Amount of Penalties recovered.
Qs. Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. Ritchie, *Mar. 19*, 1227.

Cotton Clothes Factories Acts

Violations of, with regard to Ventilation—Issue of Notice to Firms having violated Law on previous occasion.
Q. Mr. Shacketon; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 9*, 84.

Coventry Electric Tramways Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 79.
c. com. Mar. 9, 79.

County Courts Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 12*, 590.

County Courts Jurisdiction Estension Bill
Petitions Presented, *Mar. 11*, 370; *Mar. 12*, 558; *Mar. 13*, 729; *Mar. 17*, 987; *Mar. 18*, 1086; *Mar. 19*, 1215; *Mar. 20*, 1382; *Mar. 23*, 1437.

County Justices of the Peace
Necessary Qualifications.
Q. Sir E. Strachey; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *Mar. 23*, 1465.

Courts-Martial
Officers' right to be tried by.
Qs. Mr. Pirie, *Mar. 11*, 475; Colonel Welby, *Mar. 11*, 482; Mr. Bromley Davenport, *Mar. 11*, 487; Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 11*, 508, 509; Mr. Winston Churchill, *Mar. 11*, 509; Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, *Mar. 11*, 511.

Cowper, Earl
Shops (Early Closing) Bill—Difficulties in way of Local Action and Local Authority—Reasons in favour of a Shops Hours Bill instead of a Shops Closing Bill—General objections to Measures, proposed, *Mar. 20*, 1343.

Cranborne, Lord—*Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs* [Rochester]

Africa, East—Grant of Return with reference to Concessions in, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 581.

Alien Immigration in United States—Imposition of further Restrictions upon—Steps for Prevention of deportation of Aliens rejected by United States, to this country, *Mar. 11*, 380.

Argentine Finance—Delay in issue of Consular Report on, alleged, *Mar. 9*, 105.

Brussels Sugar Convention—Communication of British Government to, with regard to Laws, Orders and Regulations on Taxation of Sugar in Great Britain and Crown Colonies—Action with regard to Self-Governing Colonies—Meeting of Convention, *Mar. 23*, 1460.

Coaling Stations at Tripoli—Statement with regard to Establishment of, made in Italian Chamber—Assurances of British Government to the Contrary, *Mar. 23*, 1452.

China.

Anti-Foreign Feeling, Official Reports from Tientsin and Manchuria, regarding Government Measures, *Mar. 9*, 105.

British Railway Concessions—Number of Miles of—British Railways in construction—Action of Government with regard to, *Mar. 9*, 102.

Wuchang Viceroy—Reinstatement of Chang Chih-Tung—Influence of British Government to Secure, in Recognition of Services rendered to Foreigners during Boxer Rising, *Mar.* 9, 103.

[*cont.*

Cranborne, Lord—*cont.*

Congo Free State.

Reports of Illegal Punishments Inflicted upon Natives by Officials—Presentation of, to Parliament and Representations to Belgian Government, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 381; *Mar. 16*, 836.

Slavery—Official Reports with regard to Alleged Slavery in—Enforcement of Regulations of Berlin Conference, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 381.

Crete — Administration — Reports on, possible date of issue, *Mar. 23*, 1461.

Denmark—Agricultural Produce—Subsidization of Steamers for Carriage of—Conditions and Extent of Government Subsidies, *Mar. 9*, 83.

Fisheries — International Conference — Former Refusal of H. M. Government to take part in—Advisability of Promoting Conference, *Mar. 12*, 565.

Immigration of Foreign Criminals—Deportation from France of Criminals to this country—Representations to French Government, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1101.

Liberation of Slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba—Recommendation to Sultan's Government for Abolition of Regulations with regard to Payment of Compensation, in order to facilitate, *Mar. 18*, 1089.

Macedonia.

Gendarmerie—Russian objection to employment of German Officers only in the reorganisation of, *Mar. 17*, 997.

Reforms in—Issue of Information regarding progress of, *Mar. 23*, 1461.

Persia—British and Russian Influence in—Establishment of Definite Understanding as to Action and Influence of Great Britain and Russia in Persia—Communications with regard to, to be laid on Table, *Mar. 9*, 104.

Pilgrimages to Mecca of British Indian Pilgrims—Payment of Claims for Robberies by Brigands while on Pilgrimage—Co-operation with Netherlands Government in working for Establishment of an International Police Force for Protection of British and Dutch subjects, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1102.

Portuguese Import Duties—Representations with regard to proposed Duties on import of British Machinery, *Mar. 23*, 1462.

Russia and Persia, Tariff Agreement—Conclusion of, *Mar. 17*, 997.

St. Louis Exposition—British and Irish Commercial Industries — Arrangements for Representation of, *Mar. 9*, 103; *Mar. 16*, 836.

Cranborne, Lord—*cont.*

Shanghai—Evacuation of, by Foreign Troops—Dates of, *Mar. 16*, 835.

South Africa—Importation of Labour to—Arrangements for, Nature of, with whom made—Presentation of Explanatory Papers, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1451.

Supply—Civil Service Estimates—Government policy with regard to the misgovernment in European Turkey, *Mar. 23*, 1569.

Trade and Commerce, Foreign Undertakings—English Shareholders in Adherence to principle of British Commercial policy that Englishmen invest capital abroad at their own risk, with regard to Venezuela, *Mar. 23*, 1451.

Turkey, British Consular Officers in—Increase in Number of, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1102.

Uganda Railway—Engineers, payment of commission to, *Mar. 6*, 7.

Material for—Date of purchase of, price and firms from whom it was purchased, *Mar. 9*, 84.

Crean, Mr. E. [Cork, S.E.]

Assistant Teachers in Ireland—Compulsory return of names of teachers giving instruction in extra subjects, *e.g.* Irish in National Schools, *Mar. 12*, 567.

Ballinhassig Post Office — Inconvenient Situation of, Unsatisfactory Appointment to Postmastership, alleged — Remedy of alleged grievance, proposed, *Mar. 16*, 857.

Machinery Rating Bill—Protest against an attempt to narrow the area of taxation—Objections to Bill in present terms, *Mar. 20*, 1429.

Cremation Act

Death Certification under, Unsatisfactory system of, Introduction of Bill during present Session for purpose of carrying out recommendations of Select Committee.

Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 17*, 999.

Crete

Administration — Reports on — possible date of issue.

Q. Mr. Stevenson; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 23*, 1461.

Cripps, Mr. C. A. [Lancashire, Stretford.]

Church Discipline Bill—Defence of the majority of the Clergy—Proposals for making the intervention of the Bishops more effectual—Plea for simplification of procedure—Question of the Royal Supremacy—Power of the Privy Council, *Mar. 13*, 746, 757, 761.

Rights of Laymen, *Mar. 13*, 785.

[*cont.*

Cripps, Mr. C. A.—*cont.*
Machinery Rating Bill — Appeal to the Government — Question of Loans—Report of the Royal Commission—Reasons in favour of Bill, *Mar. 20,* 1402.

Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act
Presented, *Mar. 20,* 1341, 1383.

Crofters' Holdings Act Amendment (Scotland) Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 18,* 1110.

Crombie, Mr. J. W. [Kincardineshire]
Dunnottar Coastguard Service—Unsuitable Position of Station, out of Sight of Dangerous Rocks, resulting in alleged delay in rendering assistance to Schooner "Benmore"—Maintenance of Watch on Headland, in Communication with Station, proposed, *Mar. 17,* 991.
Fisheries — International Conference — Former refusal of H.M. Government to take part in—Advisability of Promoting Conference, *Mar. 12,* 565.

Crooks, Mr. [Woolwich]
Working Classes, Connection of his Election with Interests of.
O. Earl of Lytton, *Mar. 12,* 556.

Croydon and District Electric Tramways Bill
c. Report,* *Mar. 10,* 253.
Ordered, *Mar. 11,* 370.
1R.* *Mar. 12,* 557.
2R.* *Mar. 23,* 1435.
Com. Mar. 23, 1435.

Crystal Palace District Gas Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 9,* 79.
Com. Mar. 9, 79.

Cubitt, Mr. Henry [Surrey, Reigate]
Church Discipline — Applications for Prosecutions for Illegal Practices—Return of, during last ten years, *Mar. 6,* 5.

Cunard Co.
Agreement—Form of, and possible date of receiving Parliamentary Assent.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 13,* 730.

Customs
Assistant Clerks' Grievances—Petition of Clerks to Lords of the Treasury—Possible date of Reply.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. Hayes-Fisher, *Mar. 9,* 85.
Boatmen's Grievances—Report of Committee on — Outcome of —Improvements in System and Status of Employees.
Q. Mr. H Samuel; *A.* Mr. Hayes Fisher, *Mar. 9,* 109.
Watchers—Annual Increments—Grant of, to one-fourth of watchers—Grounds for distinction.
Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Hayes-Fisher, *Mar. 18,* 1089.

Cyprus
Taxation—Petition of members of Legislative Council for relief from heaviness of.
Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain; *Mar. 18,* 1101.

Dalziel, Mr. T. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
Supply—Civil Service Estimates—Grant for St. Louis Exhibition, *Mar. 23,* 1519.

Dartmouth, Earl of
Volunteer Rifle Ranges, Sum allocated for 1900–1901—Details of distribution, Return of Papers dealing with, proposed, *Mar. 16,* 811.

Davenport, Mr. Bromley [Cheshire, Macclesfield]
Army Officers' Removal — Reasons in favour of trying cases concerning the alleged inefficiency of officers by Court-Martial—Case of Colonel Burroughs—Case of Colonel Kinloch—Responsibility of the Commander-in-Chief—Objections to Courts of Inquiry, *Mar. 11,* 487, 498, 499, 501, 504, 506, 507.

Davey, Lord
Prevention of Corruption Bill—Suggested amendmendts, *Mar. 20,* 1372, 1374.
Shops (Early Closing) Bill—Information for local authorities required, *Mar. 20,* 1352.

Davies, Mr. A. [Carmarthen Boroughs]
Meat Contracts—Substitution of Foreign for Home-grown Meat, alleged—Wording of Contract relating to regulations with regard to kind of Meat—Alteration of, with view to rendering terms more definite, proposed, *Mar. 18,* 1094; *Mar. 23,* 1453.
St. Louis Exposition, Arrangements for Representation of British and Irish Industries at—Appointment of Royal Commission in regard to, *Mar. 9,* 103; *Mar. 16,* 853.
South African Shipping Ring—Disqualification of City agents from shipping by Conference and outside lines, *Mar. 19,* 1224.
South African War Losses, Grants for—Amount, and in what way expended, *Mar. 18,* 1100.

Death Duties
Payment of, on Licensed Properties, followed by demand for surrender of licenses upon which duty had been paid—Remedy of unsatisfactory condition of affairs—Payment at the rate of eighteen and sixteen years' purchase in case of freehold and leasehold property, respectively—Remedy proposed.
Qs. Sir W. Hart-Dyke; *As.* Mr. Ritchie, *Mar. 9,* 107; *Mar. 19,* 1226.

Deaths
Deaths from Starvation or accelerated by privation (London), *Mar. 23*, 1438.

Defence of the Empire
Acquisition of Land for National Defence, Grant of Return relative to, proposed.
Q. Mr. Black; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 23*, 1457.

Delany, Mr. [Queen's Co., Ossory]
Castletown Postmistress, Appointment of, Person responsible for, *Mar. 12*, 588.
Roscrea Labourers' Cottage Scheme, Erection of Cottage, proposed, sanction refused by Local Government Board, *Mar. 16*, 854.

Delhi Durbar
Omission of Grant of Boon or Concession, on occasion of—Steps to rectify omission.
Q. Mr. Caine; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 16*, 833.

Denaby and Cadeby Collieries
Strike of Colliers, Distress resulting from—Putting into operation of Conciliation Act, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Markham; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 17*, 998.

Denmark
Agricultural Produce—Subsidisation of Steamers for Carriage of. Conditions and extent of Government Subsidies.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Lord Cranborne. *Mar. 9*, 83.

Derby Gas Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 16*, 809.
l. com. Mar. 23, 1433.

Desertions
Army, Increasing Number in.
O. Dr. Farquharson, *Mar. 11*, 418.

Destitute Adult Blind
Petition for Legislation, *Mar. 11*, 371.

Detention of Poor Persons (Scotland) Bill
Petitions presented, *Mar. 6*, 4; *Mar. 9*, 80; *Mar. 10*, 253; *Mar. 11*, 371; *Mar. 12*, 558; *Mar. 13*, 729; *Mar. 16*, 830; *Mar. 18*, 1086; *Mar. 19*, 1216; *Mar. 20*, 1382; *Mar. 23*, 1437.

Devonport
Shipbuilding—Arrangements for Construction of One New Battleship at, proposed.
Q. Mr. Lockie; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 18*, 1090.
Telegraph Service—Decision with regard to Request for Improvement of.
Q. Mr. Kearley; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 12*, 563.

Devonshire, Duke of—*Lord President of the Council*
Shops (Hours of Closing) Bill—Question of Adjournment in Favour of Lord Avebury's Early Closing Bill—Reasons in Favour of Adjournment—Choice between Two Bills on Same Subject, *Mar. 12*, 534, 536, 537, 538, 546, 548.

Dewar, Mr. J. [Inverness]
South Uist, Distress in, Owing to Present State of Congestion—Possible Action of Congested Districts Board, with regard to, *Mar. 23*, 1448.
Supply—Civil Service Estimates—Lawlessness in the Highlands, *Mar. 23*, 1534, 1535.

Dewar, Sir T. [Tower Hamlets, St. George's]
Licences, Publicans'—Appeals against Refusals, on Grounds other than those of Misconduct—Advisability of Issuing Advice to Justices Not to Appear as Respondents in Such Appeals, *Mar. 18*, 1090.

Dewsbury, Batley and Birstal Tramways Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 17*, 985.

Dewsbury Post Office
Improved Sanitary Accommodation—Action with regard to Acquirement of New Premises, in view of Overcrowding at Present Premises.
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 23*, 1439.

Didcot, Newbury, and Southampton Railway Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 61.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles [Gloucester, Forest of Dean]
Army Reservists, Number of, in Receipt of Pay—Number not in Receipt of Messing Allowance, *Mar. 9*, 93.
Business of the House—Contradiction between Statements made with Regard to, alleged, *Mar. 18*, 1106.
China—British Railway Concessions, Number of Miles of British Railways in Construction—Action of Government with Regard to, *Mar. 9*, 102.
Cunard Agreement—Form of, and possible Date of receiving Parliamentary Assent, *Mar. 13*, 730.
Factories and Workshops—Report of Inspector of Factories, Possible Date of Issue of, Return of Lead Poisoning Cases in Pottery Works, Publication of without further Motion, *Mar. 6*, 5.
Fleet, Manning of—Committee's Report—Circulation of, previous to Discussion on Navy Estimates, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 259.
Labour Legislation and Trade Combination—Proposed Course with Regard to Motion, *Mar. 23*, 1466.

[*cont.*

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles—*cont.*

Public Accounts, Committee of—Postponement of Nomination of Members, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 269.

South Africa, Native Labour Question—Conference of South African Colonies on—Nature of and Representation of Transvaal and Orange River Colonies and Protectorates, *Mar. 19*, 1223.

Supply.

Army Estimates—Land Forces—Connection of Army Estimates—Appeal for Expenditure on different Lines — Objections to Linked Battalion System—Objections to Army Corps Scheme—Danger to Indian Frontier from Russia—Reasons against the Support of an Unwieldy Army, *Mar. 11*, 392.

Russia and Indian Frontier, *Mar. 11*, 457.

Training of Officers—University Cadets—Reports of Education Committee—Unsatisfactory Nature of English Military Training shown by South African War—Cavalry Disasters—Value of Manœuvres, *Mar. 9*, 150, 156.

Navy Estimates—Salaries of Officers, etc.—Attitude of the Country towards Naval Expenditure—Dangers of Negotiation with the Powers—Necessity for Strengthening the Home Squadron—Colonial Contributions—Defence of the Admiralty, *Mar. 17*, 1029.

Diseases of Animals Acts.

Orders Presented, *Mar. 16*, 810, 832.

Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. [Middlesex, Uxbridge]

Port of London Bill—As to date of Introduction, *Mar. 16*, 849.

Dockyards

See Navy.

Donelan, Captain

Cork Assizes. Opening of, on St. Patrick's Day — Postponement of, proposed, *Mar. 16*, 854.

Dorington, Sir John [Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury]

Church Discipline Bill—Reasons for Opposition to Second Reading, *Mar. 13*, 804.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Kent, St. Augustine's]

Adulterated Baking Powder—Case of Norwich Shop-keeper. Remittal of part Fine, proposed, *Mar. 17*, 992.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers—*cont.*

Aliens.

Criminals.

Number of—Proportion of to total Prison Population—Cost of Detention—Restoration of to Native Country on Expiration of Sentence, *Mar. 18*, 1103.

Return, Addition to, of total Cost of Carrying out Sentences passed upon Criminals, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 108.

Wage Disputes between—Necessity of Interpreting Evidence—Consequent delay in Hearing Cases of Englishmen at Worship Street Police Court. Remedy of Defects, proposed, *Mar. 17*, 997.

Army Recruits — Boy Recruits — Enlistment of, against Personal Wishes. Case of Frank Glover, *Mar. 11*, 382.

Clubs—Number Registered under Licensing Act, *Mar. 16*, 851.

Cotton Cloths Factories Acts. Violation of, with regard to Ventilation—Issue of Notice to Firms having Violated Law on previous occasions, *Mar. 9*, 84.

Cost of Military Aid to Civil Power. Charge upon Local Authority seeking Assistance — Legislation proposed, *Mar. 9*, 84.

Factories and Workshops—Report of Inspector of—Possible Date of Issue—Return of Lead Poisoning Cases in Pottery Works—Publication of, without further motion, *Mar. 5*, 5.

Justices' Clerks' Fees—Charge of Excessive Fees for Registration of Clubs, alleged, *Mar. 10*, 263.

London and Globe Finance Corporation—Prosecution of Mr. Whitaker Wright—Means for Prevention of Escape, *Mar. 11*, 383.

Police and Sanitary Regulation Bills—Committee on—Non-appointment of during next two years, *Mar. 13*, 732.

Public-house Licences.

Appeals against Refusals on Grounds other than those of Misconduct—Advisability of issuing Advice to Justices not to appear as Respondents in such Appeals, *Mar. 18*, 1090.

Transfers—Refusal to grant a Second Transfer until expiration of a fixed period, *Mar. 17*, 991.

Public Worship Regulation Act—Representations made under, to Bishop of Rochester—Reasons for omission of in Return, *Mar. 20*, 1383.

Stray Dogs—Sale of by Police—Payment of Dog Tax by Purchasers, previous to taking possession of Dog, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1451.

[*cont.*

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers—*cont.*

Traction Engines on Public Roads—Accidents caused by—Steps for protection of Public from dangers arising from, *Mar. 10*, 262.

Number of Accidents caused by Traction Engines employed in work on Great Northern, Brompton and Piccadilly Electric Railway, and Time of Occurrence—Instances of Negligence, *Mar. 12*, 559.

Vaccination—Distress Warrants, Costs involved in Execution of—Case at Melton Mowbray—Issue of Instructions to Constables with view to diminishing Excessive Costs of excuting Warrants, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1220.

Vaccination Acts—Convictions under—Treatment of Persons convicted under—Case of Pink and Cokin—Steps for Prevention of similar occurrence, *Mar. 9*, 82.

Volunteers—Council of Advice with regard to—Constitution of Submission of New Musketry Regulations to, *Mar. 20*, 1384.

Wright, Mr. Whitaker—Flight of, Alleged Neglect of necessary precautions for prevention of escape of—Duty of Executive to bring him to justice—*Mar. 11*, 515; *Mar. 12*, 582.

Dublin

Housing of Working Classes in—Unsatisfactory Condition of—Introduction of Measure during present Session with view to amending law affecting Town Tenants, etc.

Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Wyndham. *Mar. 9*, 92.

North Dublin Fisheries—Injury done to, by Trawlers — Inquiry into circumstances, proposed.

Q. Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham *Mar. 23*, 1461.

Phœnix Park—Trees destroyed by Storm in—Delay and Negligence with regard to Removal of Trees totally destroyed and repair of those partially damaged, alleged—Number of Extra Workmen employed and amount spent on reparation. Further improvement of Park, proposed.

Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor, Mr. Healy; *As.* Mr. Hayes-Fisher, Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 11*, 388; *Mar. 23*, 1440.

Post Office.

Sorters' Duties — Withdrawal of 7*s.* allowanced Sorting Postmen from certain duties, alleged—Provision of Assistants to do their work, proposed.

Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 11*, 373.

Sorter-tracers—Vacancies filled by transfers, alleged—Reservation of number of vacancies for postmen's competition, proposed.

Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 11*, 373.

Dublin—*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*

Sorting Office—Promotion of Second Division Clerk to position of First Class Assistant Superintendent—Pay previous to Promotion and present salary—Length of service, etc., of those passed over by promoted officer.

Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 16*, 856; *Mar. 23*, 1469.

University—Women's Degrees—Application for power to confer degrees upon women. Result of request.

Q. Mr. Bryce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 17*, 993.

Dublin Improvement (Bull Alley Area) Bill

Report with Amendts., *Mar. 17*, 987.
c. con. Mar. 23, 1435.

Duffy, Mr. W. [Galway, S.)

Loughrea (Galway) Loan Fund—Consideration of Scheme by Loan Fund Board. Possible date of coming into Operation, *Mar. 9*, 91.

Duke, Mr. H. [Plymouth]

Local Government (Wales and Monmouthshire)—Reasons in favour of a National Administration, *Mar. 18*, 1181.

Secretary of State for the Colonies and Welsh Parliament, *Mar. 18*, 1199.

Functions of a Welsh Assembly, *Mar. 18*, 1200.

Supply — Army Estimates — Volunteer Organisation—Injustice of War Office Regulations regarding Training, Musketry Practice, Compulsory Camps and Allowances—Objections to the application of the tests for a Regular Soldier to a Volunteer, *Mar. 9*, 220.

Dunnottar Coast-guard Service

Unsuitable position of Station—Out of sight of Dangerous Rocks resulting in Alleged Delay in Rendering Assistance to schooner "Benmore." Maintenance of Watch on Headland, in communication with Station, proposed.

Q. Mr. Crombie; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 17*, 991.

Dunraven, Earl of

Bank Holidays (Ireland) Bill.—Statement of Object of, *Mar. 17*, 986.

Durham

Drill Hall—Contribution from Government Funds towards cost of Erection—Proportion of, to Total Cost—Employment of Hall for other than Military Purposes.

Q. Mr. J. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar, 18*, 1092.

Durning, Sir Lawrence E. [Cornwall, Truro]
Parliamentary Procedure—Rules of the House — Violation of — Writing of absent Members' Names on Tickets by Present Member, in order to secure them Places, alleged, *Mar. 9*, 78.

Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir W. Hart [Kent, Dartford]
Death Duties on Licensed Properties—Payment of followed by Demand for Surrender of Licences upon which Duty had been paid—Remedy of unsatisfactory condition of affairs, *Mar. 9*, 107; *Mar. 19*, 1226.

East Ardsley Gas Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 79.
c. *com. Mar. 9*, 79.

Edinburgh
Court of Session—Inadequate Accommodation in, alleged—Immediate Remedy of Defect.
Q. Mr. Ure; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 12*, 583.

Ecclesiastical Commission
Wales, Action with regard to Patronage in.
Os. Lord Stanley of Alderley, *Mar. 9*, 63; Earl Stanhope, *Mar. 9*, 73.

Education
President—Marquess of Londonderry.
Parliamentary Secretary—Sir W. Anson.
King's Scholarships — Regulation prohibiting Information as to Marks being given to Candidates failing to obtain a Second-Class, Rescinding of, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1228.
Os. Mr. Helme, *Mar. 19*, 1332; Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 19*, 1333.
Local Authorities, Position of.
O. Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 19*, 1300.
Nottingham, Case of School at.
Os. Mr. M'Kenna, *Mar. 19*, 1322; Sir William Anson, *Mar. 19*, 1325.
Physical Training of School-Children.
Os. Dr. Macnamara, *Mar. 19*, 1293, 1332; Sir John Gorst, *Mar. 19*, 1297; Mr. John Burns, *Mar. 19*, 1303, 1310; Mr. Henry Hobhouse, *Mar. 19*, 1311, 1329; Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice, *Mar. 19*, 1313; Mr. Shaw-Stewart, *Mar. 19*, 1316; Mr. Levy, *Mar. 19*, 1317; Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 19*, 1325, 1328; Mr. Arkwright, *Mar. 19*, 1319; Mr. Yoxall, *Mar. 19*, 1320; Mr. M'Kenna, *Mar. 19*, 1322; Colonel Williams, *Mar. 19*, 1324; Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 19*, 1328.
Provisional Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools and Training Colleges, Presented, *Mar. 18*, 1087; *Mar. 19*, 1210.
Public Elementary Schools.
Contributions by Government Departments—Return ordered, *Mar. 9*, 82.

Education—*cont.*
Pupil Teachers, Question of.
Os. Mr. Henry Hobhouse, *Mar. 19*, 1313; Sir William Anson, *Mar. 19*, 1326; Mr. Helme, *Mar. 19*, 1332.
Secondary Schools, Foundation of—Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice, *Mar. 19*, 1315.
Schools, Inspection of.
Os. Sir John Gorst, *Mar. 19*, 1299; Mr. Henry Hobhouse, *Mar. 19*, 1313; Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice, *Mar. 19*, 1314; Mr. Yoxall, *Mar. 19*, 1322; Colonel Williams, *Mar. 19*, 1325; Mr. Weir, *Mar. 19*, 1334, 1336; Mr. Graham Murray, *Mar. 19*, 1335, 1336.
Science in training colleges.
O. Mr. Henry Hobhouse, *Mar. 19*, 1313.
Teachers—Qualifications of Teachers.
O. Dr. Macnamara, *Mar. 19*, 1293.
Training College examinations—Omission of Pactical Examination in Science—Reconsideration of decision with regard to, proposed.
Q. Mr. Henry Hobhouse; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 23*, 1446.
University Colleges—Reports, Presented, *Mar. 18*, 1087; *Mar. 19*, 1210.
Voluntary Schools, Position of.
Os. Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 19*, 1302; Mr. Layland Barratt, *Mar. 19*, 1333.
Ireland.
Capitation Grant to National School Teachers—Cause of delay in payment of.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 23*, 1467.
Grants—Apportionment of—Equivalent to Grant for English Education under New Act—Consideration of representations made at Dublin Educational Conference with regard to.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 23*, 1453.
Intermediate Schools, Inspection of—Diminution in number of inspectors, alleged—Steps towards placing inspectors of Intermediate Schools on permanent basis.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 9*, 110.
National School Teachers, *see* that title.
Primary Education — Allocation of Grant to—Decision with regard to.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 19*, 1231.
Technical Instruction at Monivea—Sum for rent of school building voted but not paid.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 12*, 587.
Training Colleges — Financial aid given to—Discrimination between Denominational and Undenominational Colleges as regards amount of Grant—Grant of equal privileges, proposed.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 10*, 266.

[*cont.*

Education—*cont.*
Scotland—Code of Regulations for Day Schools, Presented, *Mar. 13*, 706, 729.
Wales.
Mydrim Elementary School, Carmarthenshire, Nonpayment of Grant to.
Q. Mr. Lloyd Morgan; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 12*, 562.
Intermediate Education (Wales) Act—Report of Board of Education, Presented, *Mar. 10*, 237, 254.

Education Act
Applications under Section II. (1)—Number and Nature of, Orders for Transformation of Undenominational into Denominational Teaching — Possible Action of Board with regard to.
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 23*, 1446.
Betton Charity — Scheme for Future Regulation of Payment of Grants under.
Q. Mr. Humphreys-Owen; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 13*, 733.
Grants under, Payment of, by Instalments—Possible Continuance of Practice for Year 1904–1905.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 23*, 1447.
Section 18 (I.) (d.)—Powers of County Council to raise Sum Separably Chargeable under, by Issue of Precept to Overseers of Parish Chargeable — Application of County Rate Act to Rate Leviable for Educational Purposes.
Q. Mr. H. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 23*, 1447.
Schemes for Approval—Number submitted to Board of Education — Number having received Final Approval.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 9*, 86.
Schemes under, Number of, Providing for Appointments of Persons Nominated or Recommended by the Free Church Council—Policy of Board in dealing with such Schemes.
Qs. Earl of Salisbury, Lord Burghclere; *As.* Marquess of Londonderry, *Mar. 20*, 1376.
Schemes under New Act — Number of Schemes submitted by Town Councils, returned for Alteration — Case of Loughborough Town Council Scheme.
Q. Mr. Levy; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 19*, 1218.
School Trust Deeds — Applications for Variations of—Applications for, in Schools where they previously did not exist, Number of Cases of Schools formerly Undenominational becoming Denominational.
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 10*, 255.

Education Bill [London]
Possible Date of Introduction.
Q. Mr. Haldane; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 16*, 860.

Education, Board of
Elementary Schools and Training Colleges under—List of, Presented, *Mar. 9*, 62, 81.

Edwards, Mr. [Radnorshire]
Local Government (Wales and Monmouthshire)—Welsh desire for Extension of Powers—Action of the County Councils, *Mar. 18*, 1177.

Electric Lighting
Municipalities in competition with Retail Dealers.
O. Sir F. Banbury, *Mar. 23*, 1546.

Electric Lighting (London) Bill
Statement on 2R. Lord Wolverton, *Mar. 19*, 1211.

Elliott, Mr. [Durham]
Supply—Army Estimates—Land Forces—Necessity for Strengthening the Army—Defence of the War Office—European necessity for the British Army—Defence of the Indian Frontier—Reasons against any Reduction of the Forces, *Mar. 18*, 1138.

Ellis, Mr. J. [Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe]
Committee of Ways and Means—Motion that it be interrupted under Standing Order and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed—Motion of a debatable character, alleged, *Mar. 19*, 1235.
Mr. Chamberlain's Mission—Possible date of Presentation to Parliament of accurate Report of Statements made at meetings and interviews during Mission, *Mar. 16*, 843.
Private Business, Recommendations of Select Committee on—Steps for carrying into effect, *Mar. 11*, 389.

Emmott, Mr. [Oldham]
British and Colonial Trade—Exclusive territorial concessions in the Congo Basin — Difficulties in dealing with Shipping Bounties and Reciprocity Treaties—Question of closer Union with the Colonies—Measures to facilitate trade with India and other parts of the Empire, *Mar. 17*, 1079.
Supply—Army Estimates—Land Forces—Inadequate Authority and Information of the House on technical side of the question—Necessity for Defence of India—Dangers from Russian Invasion — Necessity for a qualified Intelligence Department, *Mar. 10*, 336.

Employment of Children Bill
Second Reading, possible date of.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 19*, 1232.

"Enchantress"
Tenders for, not invited from certain shipbuilding firms, alleged, Cause of Omission—Form of Contract with Messrs. Harland and Wolff.
Q. Sir W. Allan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 9*, 89.

Engineering
Marine Engineering Committee, Names of Members of — Strengthening of Equipment of Board—Possible date of Appointment.
Qs. Mr. Gibson Bowles; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 12*, 376.

Excise Duties
Indian Cotton, Repeal of Duty on, together with corresponding Import Duty, proposed.
Q. Sir W. Holland; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 12*, 562.

Exeter Corporation Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 61.

Export Bounties
Canadian and Australian—on Export of Butter and Iron — Importation of bounty-fed articles into United Kingdom—other than sugar—Protection of Home Industries.
Q. Mr. D. Thomas; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 16*, 850.

Factories and Workshops
Explosives-Factories — Increased Wages for Employees in, proposed.
Q. Col. Lockwood; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 17*, 994.
Report of Inspector of Factories—Possible date of issue, Return of Lead Poisoning cases in Pottery Works—Publication of, without further motion.
Q. Sir. C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 6*, 5.
Special Exceptions—Meal Hours and Night Work in Electrical Stations, *Mar. 16*, 810, 831.

False Characters Bill
c. Ordered, *Mar. 12*, 703.
1R.* *Mar. 12*, 704.

Farquharson, Dr. [Aberdeenshire, W.]
Church Street, Kensington—Possible jurisdiction of Board of Works over erection of houses in — Retention of trees, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1467.
Kensington Palace Gardens—Retention of ground at corner of, as open space, possibility of, *Mar. 19*, 1218.
Motor Cars—Identification of—Introduction of Legislation with view to facilitating, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1463.
Royal Army Medical Corps in India—Pay of Officers—Date of Introduction of Increased Scale of, *Mar. 11*, 374.

Farquharson, Dr.—*cont.*
Supply—Army Estimates—Training of Officers—Reasons for support of Scheme for Re-organisation of the Sandhurst Curriculum—Necessity for Cultivation of Personal Responsiblity—Appeal for Practical Manœuvres, *Mar. 9*, 175.
Land Forces — Protest against the excessive Estimates—Army required for India—Criticism of Army Corps System—Satisfactory Condition of Recruiting at present time—Number of Desertions—Deficiencies in Army Medical Department, *Mar. 11*, 414.

Fellowes, Mr. Ailwyn [Huntingdonshire, Ramsey]
Aberdeen New Post Office—Possible length of time required for completion of—Grant of further Supplementary Estimate, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1230.
Birdcage Walk, Defective Condition of Carriage Way, alleged—Transfer of Maintenance to Local Authority, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1466.
Serpentine—Cleaning of, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 563.

Ferguson, Mr. Munro [Leith Burghs]
Supply.
Army Estimates—Training of Officers—Support of the Scheme for Training Militia Officers in Regular Regiments—Necessity for Adequate Manœuvring Grounds—South Africa as a Training Ground—Objections to Linked Battalion System, *Mar. 9*, 173.
Navy Estimates — Attitude of the Country in relation to Expenditure, *Mar. 23*, 1502.
Complaints of the Defence Committee, *Mar. 23*, 1504.

Fergusson, Sir James [Manchester, N.E.]
Supply.
Army Estimates—Training of Officers—Report of the Education Committee—University Candidates—Inducements to rise from the Ranks—Regimental expenses, etc., *Mar. 9*, 165.

Ffrench, Mr. [Wexford, S.]
Labourers' Cottages in Ireland — Grant for encouragement of building of—Application of unexpended balance of Grant to Counties having already availed themselves of Grant, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1092.

Field, Mr. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
Dublin, Housing of Working Classes in—Unsatisfactory condition of—Introduction of measure during present Session with view to amending Law affecting town tenants, etc., *Mar. 9*, 92.

[*cont.*

Field, Mr.—*cont.*

Irish Lights Board, Possible Introduction of measure with view to re-constituting—Government attitude towards Private Members' Bill, *Mar. 9*, 90.

Financial Secretary to the Treasury

Mr. Hayes Fisher.

Finlay, Sir R. B.—*Attorney General* [Inverness Burghs]

County Justices of the Peace — Necessary qualifications, *Mar. 23*, 1465.

Frauds—Legislation facilitating prosecution of persons charged with publication of fraudulent balance sheets—Possible introduction of, *Mar. 12*, 582.

Fraudulent Trustees, Cases of—Protection of beneficiaries by compulsory application of Judical Trustees Act, or establishment of a public trustee or executor, *Mar. 17*, 989.

Innkeepers' Liability Bill—Reasons in favour of the provision of non-intoxicant refreshments by innkeepers — Scope of the Bill—Compulsion to be exercised only with regard to innkeepers proper—Question of *bonâ fide* travellers, *Mar. 6*, 20.

Judicial Trustees—Number appointed Judicial Trustees Act, *Mar. 23*, 1440.

London and Globe Finance Corporation—Purchase of shares subsequent to Company having gone into liquidation — Reconsideration of decision with regard to prosecution of directors, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 108.

Land Transfer Act—Registration of Titles—Suspension of Registration of Titles until formulation of Scheme for facilitating Registration, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 85.

Municipal Election Petition—Report of Commissioner—Issue of, to Members, proposed—Adoption of Measures for Prosecution of Persons alleged to be guilty of Bribery, *Mar. 23*, 1465.

Musical Copyright — Introduction of Measure to amend Musical Copyright Act, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 85.

Wright, Mr. Whitaker—Prosecution of—Institution of Proceedings against at expense of Creditors—Reconsideration of Decision with regard to Public Prosecution, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 581; *Mar. 16*, 852.

First Commissioner of Works

Lord Windsor.

First Lord of the Admiralty

Earl of Selborne.

First Lord of the Treasury and Prime Minister

Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour.

Fisher, Mr. Hayes—*Financial Secretary to the Treasury* [Fulham].

Church Street, Kensington, Possible Jurisdiction of Board of Works over Erection of Houses in—Retention of Lime Trees, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1467.

Civil Service.

Clerks at Maximum Salary, *Mar. 16*, 837.

Senior Assistant Clerks, Promotion of, *Mar. 17*, 992.

Customs Assistant Clerks' Grievances—Petition of Clerks to Lords of the Treasury—Possible Date of Reply, *Mar. 9*, 85.

Customs Boatmen's Grievances, Report of Committee on—Outcome of—Improvements in System and Status of Employees, *Mar. 9*, 109.

Customs Watchers—Annual Increments, Grant of, to one-fourth of Watchers—Grounds for distinction, *Mar. 18*, 1089.

Kensington Palace Gardens, Retention of ground at corner of, as open space, possibility of, *Mar. 19*, 1218.

Phœnix Park, Dublin—Trees destroyed by storm in—Delay and Negligence with regard to Removal of Trees totally destroyed and repair of those partially damaged, alleged—Number of Extra Workmen employed and Amount spent on reparation—Further improvement of Park, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1440.

Surveyors of Taxes — Employment of Clerical Assistants in Times of Pressure, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 566.

Supply.

Civil Service Estimates.

Irish National Gallery—Justification for Excess Vote, *Mar. 17*, 1005.

Irish National Gallery—Services of Sir Walter Armstrong—Action of the Treasury with regard to the Keeping of Accounts, *Mar. 18*, 1111.

Grant for St. Louis Exhibition, *Mar. 23*, 1528.

Wales—National Museum Grant—Suggested Representative Committee—Complaint as to Vagueness of Suggestions on the part of the Supporters of the Motion, *Mar. 10*, 359, 364.

Waltham Abbey Sanitary Inspector—Exemption of Government Property from Visits of, Grounds for, *Mar. 19*, 1217.

Fisheries

International Conference—Former Refusal of H.M. Government to take part in—Advisability of Promoting Conference. *Q.* Mr. Crombie; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 12*, 565.

[*cont.*

Fisheries—*cont.*
Ireland.
Extension of Close Season between Clougher Head and Belfast Lough, proposed.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 18*, 1091.
North Dublin Fisheries—Injury done to, by Trawlers — Inquiry into Circumstances, proposed.
Q. Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 23*, 1468.

Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund [Wiltshire, Cricklade]
Supply—Education Vote—Physical Training in Schools—Difference in Rural and Urban Conditions—Inspection of Schools—Secondary Schools, *Mar. 19*, 1313.

Flannery, Sir Fortescue [Yorkshire, Shipley]
Labour Legislation and Trade Combination—Proposed Course with regard to Motion, *Mar. 23*, 1466.
Supply—Navy Estimates.
Engineering work, *Mar. 16*, 893.
Importance of the Engineer Force—Age for Commencement of Training for Naval Engineer Work—Chances of Promotion—Reasons for Support of Admiralty Scheme, *Mar. 16*, 922.
Salaries of Officers, etc.—Limitation of Estimates, by Arrangement with Foreign Powers, Impossible —Necessity for Increased Expenditure — Colonial Contributions—Reasons in favour of the Naval Base in Scotland—Admiralty Training Scheme—Salaries of Engineers—Necessity for Expenditure on the Intelligence Department—Boiler Question, *Mar. 17*, 1023.
United States and English Food Supply, *Mar. 23*, 1478, 1479, 1481.
Possible Maritime Opponents of England, *Mar. 23*, 1481.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]
Listowel Union—Erection of Labourers' Cottages in—Delay of, alleged, *Mar. 12*, 567.
St. Louis Exposition—Irish Industries—Representation of, *Mar. 9*, 104.
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturdays (Ireland) Bill—Objections to Bill as a Coercive and Useless Method — Drunkenness in Ireland, *Mar. 6*, 46, 52.
War Office—Civil Service Clerks, Return relative to, requested, *Mar. 23*, 1456.

Fleet
Increase of, Committee to Report on—Names of Members of—Decision with regard to Establishment of new Naval Base in Firth of Forth.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 12*, 578.

Fleet—*cont.*
Manning of—Committee's Report—Circulation of, previous to Discussion on Navy Estimates, proposed.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 10*, 259.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]
Hourihane, Police Sergeant — Evidence and Conduct of, during hearing of Charleville Licensing Case, and on other occasions—Action of Constabulary Authorities with regard to, *Mar. 12*, 585.
Officers' Uniforms—Issue of Circular to Firms of Tailors for Terms for Supplying—Exclusion of Irish Firms, alleged, *Mar. 11*, 378.

Food Supply in War Time
Government Inquiry into—Constitution, Scope, Date of Appointment.
Q. Sir H. Seaton-Karr; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 11*, 390.
Navy Estimates, Considered in Connection with.
Os. Mr. Labouchere, *Mar. 23*, 1478, 1487; Mr. Gibson Bowles, *Mar. 23*, 1478, 1487; Sir Fortescue Flannery, *Mar. 23*, 1478, 1481; Sir John Colomb, *Mar. 23*, 1505.

Foreign Jurisdiction Act
Orders in Council Presented, *Mar. 17*, 985, 988.

Foreigners' Marriages Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 9*, 114.

Foster, Sir W. [Derbyshire, Ilkestone]
Cremation Act, Death Certification under —Unsatisfactory System of—Introduction of Bill during present Session for purpose of carrying out Recommendations of Select Committee, *Mar. 17*, 999.
Supply.
Army Estimates—Retired Pay—Protest against the Vote, *Mar. 12*, 687.
Civil Service Estimates — Advisory Boards—Railway Rates—Grant for St. Louis Exhibition, *Mar. 23*, 1526.

Fowler, Sir H. [Wolverhampton, E.]
Judicial Trustees — Number Appointed under Judicial Trustees Act, *Mar. 23*, 1440.
Rights of Property in India—Deprivation of, on Account of Religious Belief—Action of Durbar with regard to Removal of such Disabilities, *Mar. 12*, 561.

Frauds
Legislation Facilitating Prosecution of Persons Charged with Publication of Fraudulent Balance Sheets—Possible Introduction of.
Q. Mr. Norman; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *Mar. 12*, 582.

Free Church Council
Education Act—Schemes Under, Number of, Providing for Appointment of Persons Nominated or Recommended by Council—Policy of Board in Dealing with.
Qs. Earl of Salisbury, Lord Burghclere; *As.* Marquess of Londondery, *Mar. 20*, 1376.

Friendly Societies
Reports of Chief Registrar, Presented, *Mar. 19*, 1211.

Frinton-on-Sea Sea Defences Bill
l. com. Mar. 9, 61.

Galloway, Mr. W. T. [Manchester, S.W.]
Supply.
Army Estimates—Pay of Army—Defence of the Secretary of State for War, *Mar. 12*, 614.
Reasons against reduction of the Vote —Appeal to the Government to limit expenditure to present amount, *Mar. 12*, 640.

Germany
Navy, Admiral, age of in the.
Os. Mr. Haldane, Sir John Gorst, *Mar. 16*, 914.
Navy, Alleged signification of the growth of the.
O. Mr. R. Lucas, *Mar. 16*, 962.
Tariff—Countervailing duties on British Exports to Germany, increase of, alleged—Imposition of duties on German goods imported into Great Britain or revision of tariff, proposed.
Q. Colonel Sadler; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 19*, 1217.

Gibbs, Mr. Vicary [Hertfordshire, St. Albans]
Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway Bill, *Mar. 12*, 679.
Church Discipline Bill—Equal disapproval of Ritualism and of the Bill—Objections to methods of the Church Association—Reasons for preservation of the Bishop's Veto—Unsuitability of the Privy Council to deal with Spiritual Matters, *Mar. 13*, 763.
City and N.E. Surburban Electric Railway Bill—Reasons for postponement of 2R.—Bill regarded as an interference with the Royal Commission on London Traffic, *Mar. 12*, 663.
Supply.
Army Estimates—Land Forces—Unsatisfactory quality of recruits —Importance of examination into the health and morality of recruits—Numbers of illiterate recruits and boys unavailable for Foreign Service —Motion for the reduction of the Vote, *Mar. 18*, 1120.
Comparison between English and Foreign recruiting, *Mar. 18*, 1148.
Wages of inefficients, *Mar. 18*, 1150.
Withdrawal of Motion, *Mar. 18*, 1160.

Gilhooly, Mr. T. [Cork Co., W.]
Irish Primary Education—Allocation of grant to—decision with regard to, *Mar. 19*, 1231.
White Estate, near Bantry—Delay in Sale of, alleged—Expediting of disposal to Tenants, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1231.

"Good Hope," H.M.S.
Speed and Coal Consumption.
Q. Sir W. Allan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 9*, 88.

Gordon, Maj. W. Evans [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
Supply—Army Estimates—Proposed reduction of Land Forces—Necessity for reform in the War Office—Question of men required for Indian defence—Alleged danger from Russia—Objections to Army Corps Scheme—Protest against Policy of the War Office, *Mar. 10*, 330.

Gorleston and Southtown Gas Bill.
c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 79.
com. *Mar. 9*, 79.

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John [Cambridge University].
Supply.
Army Estimates—Land Forces—Inadequate reasons from the Government for the support of increased Regular Forces—Defence of Coaling Stations, *Mar. 10*, 342.
Pay of the Army—Responsibility of the Committee, *Mar. 12*, 648.
Colonial Vote—Recruiting of Natives in Central Africa, *Mar. 19*, 1248.
Education Vote—Objections to present scheme of physical education —Effect of military drill on Volunteering — Organisation of the Inspectors' Staff—Necessity for women-inspectors, *Mar. 19*, 1297.
Navy Estimates — Objections to Admiralty Scheme of Naval Training — Reasons against entering little boys in competitive examinations, *Mar. 16*, 898.
German Admiral age, *Mar. 16*, 914.
Marine Engines, *Mar. 16*, 917.
Specialised education for Naval Cadets, *Mar. 16*, 919.
Question of competitive examination, *Mar. 16*, 920.
Age of entry, *Mar. 16*, 931.

Goschen, Vis.
Prevention of Corruption Bill—Criticism of Amendments, *Mar. 20*, 1372.

Goulding, Mr. E. A. [Wiltshire, Devizes].
Alien Immigration—Non-enforcement of Section 3 of Act, empowering Customs Officers to demand name, origin and passport of aliens landing in this country, *Mar. 10*, 259.
Army, Strength of—Inclusion of men on gratuity furlough in calculation of, *Mar. 9*, 98.

Government Departments
Distribution of Work—Form of Inquiry into — Report on advisability of equalising scales of salaries of first division officials in accordance with recommendations of Playfair and Ridley Commission.
Q. Mr. D. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *Mar. 11*, 382.

Granby, Marquess of
Light Locomotives (Ireland) Bill—Authority of the County Councils, *Mar. 16*, 820.

Grant, Mr. Corrie [Warwickshire, Rugby]
High Pavement Board School, Nottingham — Inadequate accommodation for scholars, under new rules—Transfer of scholars to All Saints National School, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 265.
Justices' Clerks Fees—Charge of excessive fees for registration of clubs, alleged, *Mar. 10*, 263.

Great Central Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 23*, 1435.
com. Mar. 23, 1435.

Great Eastern (No. 1) Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 16*, 829.

Great Eastern (No. 2) Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 16*, 829.

Great Northern and City Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *com. Mar. 10*, 251.

Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway (Various Powers) Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 16*, 829.

Great Northern Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 79.
c. com. Mar. 9, 79.

Great Western Railway (Pension Fund) Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 79.
c. Com. Mar. 9, 79.
Report with Amendt., Mar. 17, 987.
c. con. Mar. 23, 1435.

Greenwich Hospital
Organisation—Pension System, etc.
Qs. Mr. Reginald Lucas, *Mar. 16*, 955; Mr. Kearley, *Mar. 16*, 963; Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 16*, 966.

Greenwich Hospital Acts
Order in Council, Presented, *Mar. 17*, 985, 988.

Grenadier Guards
Condition of, under Col. Kinloch.
Qs. Duke of Bedford; *As.* Earl of Hardwicke, *Mar. 10*, 243.

Gretton, Mr. John [Derbyshire, S.]
Innkeepers' Liability Bill—Favourable attitude of innkeepers in general—Reasons in favour of Bill, *Mar. 6*, 19.

Grey, Sir E. [Northumberland, Berwick]
Supply—Army Estimates—Land Forces—Lessons to be learnt from South African War—Necessity for increasing efficiency of Intelligence Department—Defence of Indian Frontier—Arguments in favour of keeping troops in South Africa—Reasons for reduction in numbers of Regular Forces, *Mar. 11*, 428, 454.

Grocers' Licences (Scotland) Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 12*, 589.

Groves, Mr. J. G. [Salford, S.]
Machinery Rating Bill—Necessity for immediate legislation—Reasons for support, *Mar. 20*, 1427.

Gurdon, Sir B. [Norfolk, N.]
Innkeepers' Liability Bill — Amendment to Licensing Bill to provide that licence-holders refusing reasonable demands for refreshment be liable to a fine—Difference between Innkeepers and Licensed Victuallers—Probable effect of the Bill on consumption of Intoxicants—Motion for 2R., *Mar. 6*, 8.
Supply — Colonial Vote — South African Affairs—Native Labour on Mines—Conduct of Native Police, *Mar. 19*, 1259.

Guest, Mr. [Plymouth]
Supply —Army Estimates—Motion to reduce Land Forces by 27,000 men — War Office Administration—Protest against extravagant Outlay—Duty of the Committee to examine Estimates minutely—Condition of National Finances examined — Deficiency in Organisation of Reserve — Reasons in favour of a Smaller Army, *Mar. 10*, 319, 330.
Suggested reduction of Battalions, *Mar. 11*, 425.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B. [Haddingtonshire]
Education Bill for London—Possible date of Introduction, *Mar. 16*, 860.
Supply.
Army Estimates—Training of Officers —University Candidates—English Army Organisation contrasted with that of other countries—Lack of special knowledge of their profession in Military Officers, *Mar. 9*, 140, 162.

[*cont.*

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
- Supply—*cont.*
  - Army Estimates—*cont.*
  - Navy Estimates—Reasons in favour of reducing the age for Officers to join the Navy—German Admiral Age—Necessity for engineering capacity—Combination of secondary and specialised education advisable for Naval Cadets—Reasons for general support of the Admiralty Scheme, *Mar. 16*, 913.

Hall, Mr. E. M. [Lancashire, Southport]
- Alien Immigration in the United States—Imposition of further restrictions upon—Steps for Prevention of Deportation of Aliens rejected by United States to this Country, *Mar. 11*, 380.

Halsbury, Earl of—*Lord Chancellor*
- London County Asylum (Receiving Houses) Bill—Reasons for withdrawal as a Private Bill, *Mar. 12*, 523.
- Marine Insurance Bill—Reasons in favour of 2R. *Mar. 13*, 727.
  - Contracts of Marine Insurance, *Mar. 13*, 728.
- Prevention of Corruption Bill, *Mar. 10*, 237; *Mar. 20*, 1369, 1371, 1372, 1373, 1374, 1375.
- Shops (Hours of Closing) Bill—Motion for adjournment of Debate on Bill in favour of Lord Avebury's Early Closing Bill, *Mar. 12*, 531, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537.
- Shops (Early Closing) Bill—Choice between two Bills on the same Subject, *Mar. 12*, 546.
  - Attitude of Shopkeepers, *Mar. 20*, 1352.
  - Expenses of the Local Authorities, *Mar. 20*, 1356.

Halsey, Mr. T. F. [Herts, Watford]
- Private Bill Committtees, Excuses of Members from serving on, on ground of private profession—Number of Cases and Number of Excuses accepted, *Mar. 19*, 1225.

Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G.—*Secretary of State for India* [Middlesex, Ealing]
- Aden.
  - Barracks, Condition of—Report on—Possibility of improvement of, *Mar. 9*, 86.
  - Operations in—Dispatch of Additional Troops—Cost—Possible length of Detention — Operations under Control of India Office, *Mar. 11*, 380.
- Army.
  - Indian Cavalry—Abolition of Lance in, *Mar. 16*, 849.
  - Pay—Increase of to British Troops in India—Effect on Indian Budget, *Mar. 19*, 1221.

Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord. G.—*cont.*
- Royal Army Medical Corps in India—Pay of Officers—Date of Introduction of—Increased Scale of, *Mar. 11*, 374.
- China—Anti-Foreign Rising—Grant of International Medal to Allied Forces in China, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 562.
- Currency—Number of Gold Coins paid into Indian Treasuries for Fiscal Payments—Number paid out for State Obligations, *Mar. 12*, 581.
- Excuse Duties on Indian Cotton—Repeal of, together with corresponding Import Duties, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 562.
- Lower Burma, Chief Judge of—Departure from precedent with regard to qualifications for post of — Grounds for decision, *Mar. 23*, 1450.
- Rights of Property in India—Deprivation of, on account of religious belief—Action of Durbar with regard to removal of such disabilities, *Mar. 12*, 561.
- Water Storage and Irrigation Commission—Recommendations of—Carrying out of at early date, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 580.
- Winter, Captain—Case of—Possible action of Authorities with regard to, under conviction for assaulting natives, *Mar. 23*, 1450.

Hampton Court Gas Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *com.*, *Mar. 10*, 251.

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. W., *President of Board of Agriculture* [Preston]
- Sheep Worrying in Scotland—Possible date of introduction of Bill with regard to, *Mar. 19*, 1228.
- Supply.
  - Board of Agriculture—Constitution of, *Mar. 19*, 1338.
  - Civil Service Estimates—Control of Board of Agriculture and Advisory Committees — Railway Rates — Position in Scotland—Regulation with regard to Swine Fever—Question of Remounts, *Mar. 23*, 1523.
- Swine Fever—Police Prosecution for omitting to notify swine fever on farm premises—Neglect of Inspector, alleged, *Mar. 16*, 833.

"Hannibal," H.M.S.
- Oil Fuel Trials—General result of.
  - *Q.* Mr. D. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 11*, 378.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir W. [Monmouthshire, W.]
- Church Discipline Bill—Responsibility of Parliament — Necessity for stern measures for repression of Ritualism—Ineffectual procedure of the Primates—Bishops' Veto—Rights of the Laity—Appeal to pass the 2R. of the Bill, *Mar. 13*, 776.
- Bishops' Veto in Liverpool, *Mar. 13*, 792, 793.

Hardie, Mr. J. K. [Merthyr Tydvil]

Post Office Wages, Low Rate of—Statement of Mr. Justice Phillimore—Possible action for Improvement of, *Mar. 19*, 1229.

Supply.

Civil Service Estimates — Native Labour in South Africa—Gold-mining Claims in the Transvaal, *Mar. 23*, 1529; Miners' Claim, *Mar. 23*, 1533.

Colonial Vote—South African Affairs—Miners' Grievances—Law regarding White Miners, *Mar. 19*, 1251; Native Recruiting in Central Africa and Taxation, *Mar. 19*, 1253; White Labour in Mines, *Mar. 19*, 1254; Deputation denied Audience by the Colonial Secretary, *Mar. 19*, 1262.

Taxation on South African Natives—Opportunity for discussion of, requested, *Mar. 18*, 1098.

Hardwicke, Earl of—*Under Secretary of State for War*

Colonel Kinloch—Sentence passed on for Dereliction of Duty—No opportunity afforded him to defend himself until nine days after Promulgation of Sentence, *Mar. 10*, 246.

First Grenadier Guards — Condition of Affairs under Colonel Kinloch's Command — Excessive Strength of Battalion—Number of Recruits joining Battalion—Number of Officers, Non-commissioned Officers and Men equipped for South Africa—Number Invalided home passing through Battalion — Number of Officers joining—Lack of Senior Subalterns, Quartermaster, Orderly Room Clerk, Non-commissioned Officers; Application by Colonel Kinloch for Clerical help, *Mar. 10*, 243.

Militia Ballot Bill, *Mar. 13*, 724, 725, 726.

Soldiers discharged with Pension—Number of, so discharged since outbreak of South African War, for Diseases not directly attributable to Active Service; More thorough Examination of Recruits proposed, *Mar. 19*, 212.

Volunteer Rifle Ranges.

Government Grants towards acquirement of Ranges—Increase of, proposed, *Mar. 16*, 813.

New Ranges, Provision of—Necessity for, under New Regulations with regard to Length of Range—Assistance to be given preferably to old Corps in matter of Acquisition of new Range, *Mar. 16*, 816.

Sums Allocated for, 1900–1901—Details of Distribution, Return of Papers dealing with, proposed, *Mar. 16*, 811.

Harmsworth, Mr. R. L. [Caithness]

Halkirk, Caithness—Decision of Congested Districts Board, applied for.

Army.

General Annual Return — Possible date of re-issuing of, *Mar. 9*, 94.

Strength of—Inclusion of Militia and Volunteers Staffs in total strength of Army, *Mar. 9*, 94.

Chatham Dockyard—Private Foot-paths in—Reservation of for use of officers only—Removal of Order previous to, and replacement of, subsequent to visit of First Lord, *Mar. 23*, 1443.

Men-of-War—Glass Balls on Mastheads—By whom purchased, *Mar. 23*, 1444.

Naval Gunnery—Prize-winners—Display of names of, Score and nature of gun on lower deck of each ship, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1443.

Naval Victualling—Improved scale of rations, accompanied by improved system of cooking and serving food, *Mar. 23*, 1443.

Seaman, Imprisonment of a — Case of R. Moore —Revision of Sentence, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 87.

Harrow and Stanmore Gas Bill

l. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 61.

Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Bill

c. Report,* *Mar. 10*, 252.
c. Ordered, *Mar. 11*, 370.
c. 1R.* *Mar. 12*, 557.

Harrogate Water Bill

l. com. Mar. 9, 62.

Harwood, Mr. G. [Bolton]

Supply — Navy Estimates — Submarine boats — Training of Officers — Importance of engineering—Exclusiveness of the Navy under present system, *Mar. 16*, 976.

Hastings Harbour Bill

l. Com. Mar. 9, 62.

Hastings Harbour District Railway Bill

l. 2R.* *Mar. 12*, 520.
l. Com. Mar. 19, 1209.

Hay, Mr. C. G. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]

Alien Immigration.

Criminals — Proportion of to total foreign population, *Mar. 18*, 1103.

Deportation from France of Criminals to this country—Representations to French Government, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1101.

Army.

Ordnance Departments—Tenders for Contract No. 2, 1773, Acceptance of Lowest Tender, *Mar. 17*, 995.

[*cont.*

Hay, Mr. C. G.—*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Recruiting—Transfer of Recruit from Militia to Army—Inclusion of in numbers of both Militia and Army, thus reckoning one recruit as two, *Mar. 9*, 98.

Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway Bill—Reasons for opposition to 2R—Objections to Bill in present form as granting power to the Yerkes and other profit-seeking syndicates—Connection with Housing Question, *Mar. 11*, 471.

Objections withdrawn, *Mar. 11*, 475.

Civil Service—Senior Assistant Clerks, Promotion of, *Mar. 17*, 992.

Customs Assistant Clerks' Grievances—Petition of Clerks to Lords of Treasury, Possible date of reply, *Mar. 9*, 85.

London United Tramways Bill (By Order) Reasons for postponement of discussion on the Bill until after the report of the Royal Commission—Irregularities with regard to Private Bill legislation, *Mar. 19*, 1304.

Savings Bank—Removal of to West Kensington, necessitating appointment of Telegraph Staff—System of Promotion to New Appointments, *Mar. 10*, 258.

Supply — Army Estimates — Volunteer Organisation — Injustice of Regulations — Difficulties of Compulsory Camps—Financial Burdens imposed on Volunteer Officers—Complaint of War Office attitude towards the Volunteer Forces, *Mar. 9*, 232.

Hayden, Mr. J. P. [Roscommon, S.]

Macedonian Gendarmerie—Russian objection to employment of German Officers only in the reorganisation of, *Mar. 17*, 997.

Midland and Belfast and Northern Counties Railways Bill—Motion for Rejection, seconded, *Mar. 23*, 1540.

Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur [Walsall]

Supply.

Army Estimates—Military Training of Officers—Report of the Committee—Reduction of the Expenditure on Military Education—Defects in Sandhurst System — University Candidates — Necessity for checking Expenses in Cavalry Regiments, *Mar. 9*, 128.

Pay of Army—Objections to Army Corps System as conducive to Increased Expenditure with return—Impossibility of carrying out Policy of Decentralisation, *Mar. 12*, 613.

Decentralisation and District Commanders, *Mar. 12*, 618.

Civil Service Estimates — Irish National Gallery — Reasons for Excess Vote, *Mar. 17*, 1005, 1006.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth]

Civil Service—Clerks at Maximum Salary, etc., *Mar. 16*, 837.

Phœnix Park, Dublin—Trees destroyed by Storm in—Delay and Negligence with regard to removal of trees totally destroyed and repair of those partially damaged, alleged—Number of Extra Workmen employed, and Amount spent on reparation—Further improvement of Park, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1440.

Helme, Mr. N. W. [Lancashire, Lancaster]

King's Scholarships — Regulations prohibiting Information as to Marks, being given to Candidates failing to obtain a Second Class—Rescinding of, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1228, 1332.

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. C. H. [Tyrone, N.]

Innkeepers' Liability Bill—Limitations of the Bill—Incentive to Temperance in the Supply of Tea and Coffee by the Licensed Victuallers, *Mar. 6*, 22.

Midland and Belfast and Northern Counties Railways Bill—Reasons for Support of Bill—Suggested Amendments, *Mar. 23*, 1543.

Hereford, Bishop of

Macedonian Affairs—Outrages committed by the Turks in Macedonia—Responsibility of the Great European Powers, *Mar. 12*, 713.

Hereford, Lord James of

Prevention of Corruption Bill—Suggested Amendments, *Mar. 20*, 1372, 1373, 1375.

Hexham Gas Bill

l. Report,* *Mar. 12*, 520.

Hoare, Sir Samuel [Norwich]

Church Discipline Bill—Limitations of Bill — Appeal for consideration by Select Committee — Reasons against Second Reading, *Mar. 13*, 799.

Machinery Rating Bill — Necessity for uniform assessment — Costliness of litigation—Reasons for support of 2R. *Mar. 20*, 1408.

Removal of Factories from the Cities, *Mar. 20*, 1419.

Hobhouse Mr. C. [Bristol.]

Aden — Operations in—Dispatch of additional troops,—Cost—possible length of detention—Operations under control of India Office, *Mar. 11*, 380.

Army Buildings on Salisbury Plain—Map showing buildings erected, or in course of construction on, to be placed in Tea Room, *Mar. 9*, 96.

British Campaigns and Expeditions—Number of during last Ten Years—Number of Troops employed, etc., *Mar. 9*, 96.

Hobhouse, Mr. C.—*cont.*

Malta—Soldiers' Club at—Revival of, provision of suitable accommodation for—Management of, *Mar. 9*, 95.

Sandhurst Military College—Expenses of Second Year's Training of defrayed by parents or State, *Mar. 20*, 1384.

Somaliland—Alleged object of Campaign—to give prominent share to Somali levies—foundation for statements, *Mar. 12*, 375.

Africa, South, Drafts for—Age and size of—Call for Report, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1456.

Supply.

Army Estimates—Training of Officers—Necessity for adequate training of Non-commissioned Officers—System of Staff College Examinations advocated—Lack of Efficient Staff Officers in South Africa—Appeal for training of Auxiliary Officers, *Mar. 9*, 158.

Pay of Army—Commanders of Army Corps in time of War—Case of General Truman, *Mar. 12*, 624.

Inefficiency and expense of men employed in Garrison Regiments and Native and Chinese Regiments in charge of Coaling Stations—Barracks for wives and families of reservists, *Mar. 12*, 641.

Hobhouse, Mr. H. [Somerset, E.]

Education Act, Section 18 (1) (d) Power of County Council to raise Sums separably chargeable under, by Issue of Precept to Overseers of Parish Chargeable. Application of County Rate Act, to Rate Leviable for Educational Purposes, *Mar. 23*, 1447.

Local Councils—Government Grants—Payment of—Possibility of further Payments in respect of Residue (Beer and Spirits Duty) Grant. Comparison of this year's Grants with those of last year, etc., *Mar. 16*, 836.

Training College Examinations—Omission of Practical Examination in Science.

Reconsideration of Decision with regard to, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1446.

Supply—Education Vote—Physical Training in Schools—Different Conditions in Rural and Urban Districts—Inspection of Schools—Qualifications and Age of Inspectors—Science Examinations in Training Colleges—Question of Pupil Teachers, *Mar. 19*, 1131; Local Authorities and Board of Education, *Mar. 19*, 1329.

Holland, Sir W. H. [Yorks. W. R., Rotherham].

Excise Duties on Indian Cotton—Repeal of, together with corresponding Import Duties, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 562.

Hope, Mr. J. Fitzalan [Sheffield, Brightside]

Machinery Rating Bill—Difference of Effect on various parts of the Country—Influence on Housing Question—Reasons for Opposition, *Mar. 20*, 1413.

Supply.

Army Estimates—Land Forces—Reasons for Support of the Government, *Mar. 11*, 467.

Navy Estimates—Increased Production of Armour Plates, *Mar. 16*, 976.

Horses for the Army

Conditions of Classification of Horses as Effective—Distinction in Army Estimates between Remount and Effective Horses, proposed.

Q. Colonel Welby; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1096.

Houldsworth, Sir William [Manchester, N. W.]

Machinery Rating Bill—Necessity of Government Action—Expense of Litigation under the Present System, *Mar. 20*, 1398.

Hourihane, Police Sergeant

Evidence and Conduct of—during hearing of Charleville Licensing Case, and on other occasions. Action of Constabulary Authorities with regard to.

Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 12*, 585.

Housing of the Working Classes Bill

c. 1R.* *Mar. 10*, 268.

Hove, Worthing and District Tramways Bill

l. 2R.* *Mar. 16*, 809.
l. com. Mar. 23, 1433.

Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill

c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 79.
c. com. Mar. 9, 79.

Humphreys-Owen, Mr. A. E. [Montgomeryshire]

Education—Betton Charity—Scheme for future regulation of payment of Grants under, *Mar. 13*, 733.

Huntly, Marquess of

Volunteer Rifle Ranges—Government Grants towards acquirement of ranges Increase of, proposed, *Mar. 16*, 813.

Hutton Mr. A. E. [Yorks., W.R., Morley]

Supply—Army Estimates—Retired Pay—Point of order, *Mar. 12*, 695.

Number of Officers on Retired Pay, *Mar. 12*, 697.

Incest Bill

c. 2R. *Mar. 5*, 1684.

Income Tax

Alteration in Dates of Payment.
Q. Mr. Lockie; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *Mar. 18*, 1091.

India

Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Lord G. Hamilton.
Under Secretary—Earl of Hardwicke.

Army.

O. Mr. Edmund Robertson, *Mar. 10*, 287.

Cavalry—Abolition of Lance in.
Q. Colonel Legge; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 16*, 849.

Pay, Increase of, to British Troops—Effect on Indian Budget.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 19*, 1221.

Reliefs for India—Dates of embarkation of.

Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 17*, 994.

Boer Prisoners of War in—Harsh treatment of—reason for and number subjected to—Arrangements for prisoners willing to sign the conditions of peace but unwilling to take the oath of allegiance.
Qs. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Earl Percy, *Mar. 9*, 101.

Captain Winter, Case of—Possible action of authorities with regard to Captain Winter, under conviction for assaulting natives.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 23*, 1450.

Currency—Number of gold coins paid into Indian Treasuries for fiscal payments—number paid out for State obligations.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 12*, 581.

Delhi Durbar, *see* that title.

Excise Duties on Cotton—Repeal of, together with corresponding import duties, proposed.
Q. Sir W. Holland; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 12* 562.

Expeditionary Force, Defence of the Frontier by.
Os. Mr. Beckett, *Mar. 18*, 1137; Mr. Elliot, *Mar. 18*, 1142; Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1145.

Land Force required for Defence.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Mar. 10*, 316; Major Evans-Gordon, *Mar. 10*, 332; Mr. Emmott, *Mar. 10*, 338; Mr. Gibson Bowles, *Mar. 10*, 348; Sir Charles Dilke, *Mar. 11*, 401; Dr. Farquharson, *Mar. 11*, 415; Sir Edward Grey, *Mar. 11*, 431; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Mar. 11*, 444; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 11*, 455.

India—*cont.*

Lower Burma. Chief judge of—Departure from precedent with regard to qualifications for post of,—grounds for decision.
Q. Mr. Moon; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 23*, 1450.

Rights of Property—Deprivation of, on account of religious belief—Action of Durbar with reference to removal of such disabilities.
Q. Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 12*, 56.

Royal Army Medical Corps in—Pay of Officers. Date of introduction of increased scale of.
Q. Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 11*, 374.

Water Storage and Irrigation Commission—Recommendations Carrying out of at early date, proposed.
Q. Mr. S. Smith; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 12*, 580.

Indiarubber, Gutterpercha, and Telegraph Works Company Bill

l. 2R.* *Mar. 6*, 1.

Innkeepers' Liability Bill

c. 2R.* *Mar. 6*, 8.

Inspector-General of Auxiliary Forces

Responsibilities and Limitations of the Office.
Os. Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9*, 194; Sir Gilbert Parker, *Mar. 9*, 194; Sir Howard Vincent, *Mar. 9*, 201.

Intelligence Department

Army.

Expenditure, Reduction of.
Os. Mr. W. Churchill, *Mar. 12*, 594; Lieutenant-Colonel Kemp, *Mar. 12*, 645; Lord Stanley, *Mar. 12*, 643.

Necessity for Efficiency.
Os. Sir Edward Grey, *Mar. 11*, 431; Major Rasch, *Mar. 11*, 465.

Navy.

Organisation.
Os. Sir F. Flannery, *Mar. 17*, 1027.

International Mercantile Marine Company

Agreement between H.M. Government and—Lines and Scope of—Violation of Merchant Shipping Act, alleged.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 23*, 1462.

Ipswich Gas Bill

c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 79.
Com. Mar. 9, 79.

Ireland

Afforestry in, Consideration by Irish Board of Agriculture of Recommendations of Committee on British Forestry—With view to Promoting.
Q. Mr. O'Mara; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 18*, 1104.

Ancient Monument at Greenan, Londonderry — Arrangement between Proprietor of Greenan and Commissioners of Public Works with regard to.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 18*, 1091.

Antrim, Down, Armagh, and Belfast Electric Power Bill.
l. Com. Mar. 9, 61.

Ballylaneen—Extra Police at—Reason for reinforcement—Cost of, and to whom charged.
Q. Mr. Power; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 16*, 838.

Bank Holidays Bill—Suggested Amendment.
Os. Mr. Atkinson, Earl of Dunraven, *Mar. 10*, 367; *Mar. 17*, 986.

Buncrana and Cardonagh Railway—Appointment of Arbitrators in connection with—Amount certified by, to be due and payable by the Donegal County Council on foot of the guarantee.
Q. Mr. M'Fadden; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 9*, 113.

Buncrana Barracks—Delay in Erection, alleged.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 17*, 994.

Burtonport Extension Railway—Steps towards securing charge of Reasonable rates and fares on.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 19*, 1222.

Canal Rates—Representations of Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction to Railway and Canal Commissioners — with regard to excessive rates charged by Midland Great Western Railway.
Q. Mr. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 23*, 1452.

Charleville Licensing Case—Evidence and Conduct of Police Sergeant Hourihane —during hearing of, and on other occasions—Action of Constabulary authorities with regard to.
Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 12*, 585.

Church Temporalities—Report Presented, *Mar. 9*, 63, 81.

Cladnageragh Pier—Extension of, Steps for provision of carrying out.
Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 11*, 386.

Courts of Conscience—Annual Returns, to whom made—Number of cases tried in Limerick Court in 1902.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 10*, 267.

Ireland—*cont.*

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill.
c. 2R.* *Com. Mar. 10*, 251.

Emigration Statistics Presented, *Mar. 9*, 63, 81.

Fisheries—Close Seasons—Injury done to Fishing Industry during—Extension of Close Season between Clougher Head and Belfast Lough, proposed.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 12*, 587; *Mar. 18*, 1091.

Fishguard and Rosslare Railways and Harbours Bill.
c. 2R.* *Com. Mar. 10*, 251.

Fitzmaurice Estate — Condition of, as regards Sale to Tenants—Amount disposed of, Sale Price — Steps for Disposal of Further Portions.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 23*, 1468.

Irish Lights Board—Possible Introduction of Measure with view to Reconstituting — Government Attitude towards Private Member's Bill.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 9*, 90.

Justices of the Peace—Appointments of Working Men as—Representations to Lord Chancellor with regard to these Appointments, proposed.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 9*, 91.

Killea, Disturbances at — Unauthorised Action of Police during — Result of Inquiry into Affair.
Qs. Mr. K. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 16*, 855.

Labourers Act in Galway, Unexpended Balances under.
Q. Colonel Nolan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 18*, 1092.

Labourers' Cottages, *for* Collective Heading *see* that title.

Land Commission, *see* that title.

Land Question, *see* that title.

Light Locomotives Bill—Second Reading [H.L.] *Mar. 16*, 818.
House in Committee, *Mar. 20*, 1367.

Lismore Workhouse Mastership — Institution of Legal Proceedings against Board of Guardians for retaining Mr. G. M'Donald as Master of Workhouse.
Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 16*, 854.

Loan Fund Board—Annual Report Presented, *Mar. 23*, 1433, 1438.

Loughrea (Galway) Loan Fund—Consideration of Scheme by Loan Fund Board—Possible Date of coming into Operation.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 9*, 91.

Monivea, Galway—Technical Instruction —Sum for Rent of School Building Voted but not paid.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 12*, 587.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*
Mullingar, Kells and Drogheda Railway Bill.
c. Report,* *Mar. 10*, 252.
Ordered, *Mar. 11*, 370.
National Gallery—*Debate* [H.C.] *on Civil Service Estimates* (*Excess*), *Mar. 17*, 1003.
Resolution Reported and Discussed, *Mar. 18*, 1110.
Peat Fuel — Utilisation of—Action of Irish Government with regard to Promotion of Project for.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 18*, 1105.
Post Office, *see* that title.
Private Bill Legislation—Representations Urging Necessity for Alteration in System of.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham; *Mar. 16*, 854.
Quit Rents, Proportion of Sum Received Annually as, Spent in Ireland.
Q. Mr. O'Mara; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *Mar. 18*, 1105.
Railways—*Debate* [H.C.] *on Midland and Belfast and Northern Counties Bill, Mar. 23*, 1537.
Rathmines Police Rate—Increase of, to what Cause due — Application of Surplus to what Fund.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 11*, 386.
Roman Catholic University — Petition Against Establishment of, *Mar. 18*, 1087; *Mar. 19*, 1216; *Mar. 20*, 1382; *Mar. 23*, 1437.
Royal Irish Constabulary—Recommendations of Commission on, with regard to Pensions and Lodging Allowance—Possibility of speedily giving effect to.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 17*, 993.
St. Patrick's Day — Postponement of Local Government Audits fixed for.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 12*, 568.
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturdays Bill—*Debate* [H.C.] on 2R. *Mar. 6*, 27.
Seed Potatoes for—Publication of names and quantities of required, so that English growers may have opportunity of tendering for supply.
Q. Mr. Mansfield; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 9*, 110.
Strabane and Letterkenny Railway Bill.
c. Rep.* *Mar. 10*, 252.
Ordered, *Mar. 10*, 252.
1R.* *Mar. 11*, 369.
Swilly, Lough — Improvement of Boat Slips on, proposed.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1093.
Swinford Seed Loan—Claim of Commissioners of Works in connection with interest on loan under Seed Supply and Potato Spraying Act, Cancelling of claim, proposed.
Q. Mr. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 9*, 111.

Ireland—*cont.*
Templemore Disturbances—Investigation into—Completion and result of.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 23*, 1469.
Training Colleges—Return relative to—Grant of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 19*, 1231.
Urban Districts.
Return—Grant of, proposed.
Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 9*, 91.
Return, Ordered, *Mar. 10*, 254.
White Estate, near Bantry—Delay in sale of, alleged—Expediting of disposal to tenants, proposed.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 19*, 1231.

Jamaica
Introduction of Bill empowering guarantee out of general revenues of Colony and payment of interest on capital expended in establishing sugar factories —Constitution of such payments and guarantees as direct or indirect bounties — Submission of question to Permanent Commission at Brussels.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 23*, 1460.

Jameson, Major J. [Clare, W.]
Innkeepers' Liability Bill—Objections to Bill as trivial and unnecessary—Functions of an innkeeper — Difference between innkeepers and licensed victuallers, *Mar. 6*, 12, 26.
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturdays (Ireland) Bill — Combination of the sale of intoxicants with other trades—Objections to Bill as an encouragement of illicit drinking and an incentive to intemperance, *Mar. 6*, 41.
Supply—Army Estimates — Pay of the Army — Reasons against reduction of General Staff, *Mar. 12*, 626.

Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*Deputy Chairman* [Hants, N.]
London United Tramways Bill—Reasons against the postponement of the 2R., pending the Report of the Royal Commission, *Mar. 19*, 1306.

Jessel, Captain H. [St. Pancras, S.]
Sea Transport Medal, Eligibility of Officers of Ships conveying Troops during South African War, to receive Medal, *Mar. 13*, 731.

Jewish Colonisation Association
Petition for Bill for extension of powers of, Read, *Mar. 6*, 1.

Johnstone, Mr. J. H. [Sussex, Horsham]
Public Worship Regulation Act—Representation made under, to Bishop of Rochester—Reason for omission of in Return, *Mar. 20*, 1383.

[*cont.*

Johnstone, Mr. J. H.—*cont.*
  Surveyors of Taxes—Employment of clerical assistants, in times of pressure, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 566.

Joicey, Sir James [Durham, Chester-le-Street]
  Machinery Rating Bill—Objections to Bill, *Mar. 20*, 1395.
    Question of Government Bill, *Mar. 20*, 1425.
  Private Banks Balance Sheets—Introduction of Legislation enforcing publication of, *Mar. 16*, 858.

Jones, Mr. Brynmor [Swansea District]
  Local Government (Wales and Monmouthshire—Answer to criticism and support of Resolution, *Mar. 18*, 1183.
    Importation of Cattle, *Mar. 18*, 1195.
  Supply—Army Estimates—Pay of Army—Appeal for further information regarding expenditure on Army Corps Scheme—Salaries of Staff Officers, *Mar. 12*, 615.

Jones, Mr. William [Carnarvonshire, Arfon]
  Local Government in Wales and Monmouthshire—Claims of Wales to separate Nationality—Efficiency of Wales in the matter of Local Government, *Mar. 18*, 1171.
    English Hostility, *Mar. 18*, 1191.
  Wales—National Museum Grant—Educational value of such a Museum—Necessity for a National Storehouse for Welsh Treasures in Wales, *Mar. 10*, 350, 366.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
  Irish Courts of Conscience—Annual Returns, to whom made—Number of Cases tried in Limerick Court in 1902, *Mar. 10*, 267.
  Limerick.
    Post Office.
      Postal and Telegraph Staffs' Grievances — Record of irregularities committed by staff and consideration of, in connection with granting of annual increments, alleged, *Mar. 9*, 113.
      Vacancy for Assistant Superintendentship — Promotion of Local Official, *Mar. 9*, 113.
    Roxborough Road Schools.
      Accumulation of rents of, in hands of Commissioners—Amount of, previous to inquiry by Education Endowments Commission, *Mar. 9*, 112.
      Expenditure on repairs of, legality of—Assertion by and name of Auditor, *Mar. 11*, 384.
        Authority for such Expenditure, *Mar. 23*, 1467.

Justices' Clerks
  Fees—Charge of excessive fees for Registration of Clubs, alleged.
    Q. Mr. C. Grant ; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 10*, 263.

Kearley, Mr. H. E. [Devonport]
  Birdcage Walk, Defective Condition of Carriage Way, alleged—Transfer of Maintenance to Local Authority, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1466.
  Boy Artificers in the Navy—Dissatisfaction arising from Limitation of Right to sit for Examination as to Sons of Officers of Certain Ranks only — Revision of Conditions, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 259.
  China—Anti-Foreign Rising—Grant of International Medal to Allied Forces in China, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 562.
  Devonport Telegraph Service—Decision with regard to Request for Improved Service, *Mar. 12*, 563.
  Naval Plumbers—Rates of Pay—Decision with regard to proposed Increase of Pay of Plumbers, having received no rise for thirty-five years, *Mar. 23*, 1442.
  Supply—Navy Estimates.
    Objections to Specialised and Competitive Training for Young Children—Expense of the Admiralty Scheme of Training—Treatment of the Royal Marines and Warrant Officers—Opposition to the Admiralty Scheme on account of the early age of entry for Candidates, *Mar. 16*, 925.
    Greenwich Old Age Pensions—Action of Marine Recruiting Officers—Appeal on behalf of Pensioners, *Mar. 16*, 963; Recruiting Bills, *Mar. 16*, 967.
    Pensions, Half-pay, etc.—Question of Discussion on Non-effective Votes, *Mar. 18*, 116.
      Disparity between Established Dockyard Men and Hired Men, *Mar. 18*, 1117.
      Dockyard Wages and Pensions, *Mar. 18*, 1119.
    Reasons for Increase in Numbers of Men—Necessity for Adequate Manning of Newly-Constructed Ships—Request for Statements concerning Short Service and Long Service Rating—Reserve of Stokers, *Mar. 23*, 1510.
      Non-continuous Service, *Mar. 23*, 1513.
    Salaries of Officers, etc.—Inefficient Gunnery in the Navy, *Mar. 17*.
      Gunnery of ships in action, *Mar. 17*, 1057.
      Long distance firing on shore, *Mar. 17*, 1058.
      Appeal for the discussion of the Votes — Victualling Vote, *Mar. 17*, 1064.

[*cont.*

Kearley, Mr. H. E.—*cont.*

"Wasp" and "Cockchafer," Date of purchase, price paid, cost of maintenance, *Mar. 10*, 261.

Keble College

Appointment of Ritualistic Clergy.
Os. Mr. Austin Taylor, *Mar. 13*, 739, 771; Mr. Vicary Gibbs, *Mar. 13*, 771.

Kemp, Lieutenant-Colonel George [Lancashire, Heywood]

Supply.

Army Estimates—Pay of Army—Training of Army Corps Officers, *Mar. 12*, 626.

Recruiting question—Inefficiency of the Intelligence Department—Reasons for objections to Army Corps scheme—Connection with Navy, *Mar. 12*, 645, 646.

Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H. [Devonshire, Honiton]

Church Discipline Bill—Objections to Bill, *Mar. 13*, 802.

Kenedy, Mr. P. J. [Westmeath, North]

Irish Canal Rates—Representations of Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction to Railway and Land Commissioners, with regard to excessive rates charged by Midland Great Western Railway, *Mar. 23*, 1452.

Kensington Palace

Palace Gardens—Retention of ground at corner as open space—Possibility of.
Q. Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. Hayes-Fisher, *Mar. 19*, 1218.

Kenyon-Slaney, Colonel W. [Shropshire, Newport]

Army Officers' Removal—Defence of Colonel Kinloch and protest against the treatment of his case, *Mar. 11*, 511.

Machinery Rating Bill—Relative positions of Rural and Urban Districts—Reasons for opposition to Bill, *Mar. 20*, 1418.

King's College (London) Bill

l. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 61.

Kinloch, Colonel

Condition of 1st Grenadier Guards under—Excessive strength of battalion, number of Recruits joining battalion, number of Officers and Non-Commissioned Officers and Men equipped for South Africa—Number Invalided Home passing through Battalion—Number of Officers Joining—Lack of Senior Subalterns, Quartermaster Orderly Room Clerk, Non-Commissioned Officers, Application for Clerical Help.
Qs. Duke of Bedford; *As.* Earl of Hardwicke, *Mar. 10*, 243.

Kinloch, Colonel—*cont.*

Issue of White Paper containing Evidence of, being one part only of the Transaction—Inconsistent with Statement made by Secretary of State for War.
Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 16*, 858.

Military Cases in House of Commons—Question of Discussing.
Os. Mr. Pirie, *Mar. 11*, 475; Mr. Bromley-Davenport, *Mar. 11*, 490; Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 11*, 500; Mr. Winston Churchill, *Mar. 11*, 510; Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, *Mar. 11*, 511.

Sentence passed on, for Dereliction of Duty, No opportunity afforded Colonel Kinloch to Defend himself until Nine Days after Promulgation of Sentence.
Q. Duke of Bedford; *A.* Earl of Hardwicke, *Mar. 10*, 246.

Labouchere, Mr. Henry [Northampton]

1st Grenadier Guards—Mock Courts-Martial—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed—Evidence taken before Court of Inquiry demanded—Undesirability of Publication of—Grounds for Refusal, *Mar. 12*, 569, 571.

Coaling Stations at Tripoli—Statement with regard to establishment of, made in Italian Chamber—Assurances of British Government to the contrary, *Mar. 23*, 1452.

South Africa—Importation of Labour to—Arrangement for, nature of, with whom made—Presentation of explanatory Papers proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1451.

Supply.

Army Estimates—Pay of the Army—The House and the Country against an addition to the Army—Reasons against increased expenditure, *Mar. 12*, 635.

Responsibility of the Committee, *Mar. 12*, 648.

Navy Estimates—Salaries of Officers—Protest against Expenditure—Reasons for support of Motion for Reduction—Relations with Foreign Powers—Food supply—Attitude of the United States, *Mar. 17*, 1060; *Mar. 23*, 1476, 1487.

Trade and Commerce—Foreign Undertakings—English Shareholders in—Adherence to principle of British Commercial policy that Englishmen invest capital abroad at their own risk, with regard to Venezuela, *Mar. 23*, 1451.

Transvaal—Labour Ordinances—Laying on Table of all ordinances relating to employment of black and white labour—Changes effected in regulations subsequent to annexation of Transvaal, etc., proposed, *Mar. 12*, 579.

Labourers' Cottages, Ireland.

Ennis Scheme—Delay in sanctioning—Inquiry proposed.
Qs. Mr. W. Redmond ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 11*, 384.

Grant for encouragement of building of—Application of unexpended balance of grant to countries having already availed themselves of grant, proposed.
Q. Mr. Ffrench ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 18*, 1092.

Listowel Union—Erection of—Delay of, alleged.
Q. Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 12*, 567.
Returns ordered, *Mar. 16*, 832.

Roscrea Scheme—Erection of Cottage, proposed, Sanction Refused by Local Government Board.
Q. Mr. Delany ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 16*, 854.

Substitution of Original Applicant for a Cottage, for another, alleged.
Q. Mr. Sheehan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 18*, 1104.

Labourers (Ireland) Act

Return—Grant of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Murphy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 12*, 568.

Lambert, Mr. G. [Devonshire, South Molton]

Army Officers' Removal—Evidence of Regimental Inquiry, *Mar. 11*, 501.

Cape Rebels, Amnesty of—Decision with Regard to, *Mar. 16*, 846.

London and Globe Finance Corporation—Purchase of Shares subsequent to Company having gone into Liquidation—Reconsideration of Decision with regard to Prosecution of Directors, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 108.

National Defence, Committee of—Submission of Constitution and Powers of, to War Inquiry Commission, *Mar. 16*, 857.

Shanghai — Evacuation of, by Foreign Troops, Dates of, *Mar. 16*, 835.

Wright, Mr. Whitaker—Prosecution of—Costs, Charge of to Crown rather than to Creditors, proposed, *Mar. 16*, 852.

Lambton, Mr. F. W. [Durham, S.E.]

Supply — Army Estimates — Volunteer Organisation—Promise of a Royal Commission to Report upon the Question—Claims of the Volunteers to be Considered Seriously—Reasons for Decrease in the Volunteer Force—Objections to Compulsory System—Difficulties in the Way of Shooting Practice—Financial Burdens on the Officers—Effect of Volunteer Reforms on the Estimates—Appeal to Government to withdraw Orders in Council to which Volunteers object, *Mar. 9*, 177.

Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway Bill

c. Ordered *Mar. 11*, 370.
c. 1R.* *Mar. 12*, 557.
c. 2R.* *Mar. 23*, 1435.
com. Mar. 23, 1435.

Lancashire

Smallpox—Outbreak of, Spread of Infection by Tramps, alleged, Action of Board with regard to Arresting Spread of Disease.
Q. Sir J. Leese ; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 10*, 264.

Lancashire and Yorkshire and London and North Western Railways (Steam Vessels) Bill

c. 2R.* *Mar. 13*, 728 ; *Mar. 18*, 1085.

Land

Registration of writs in Scotland, *see* Scotland.

Land Commission, Ireland

Estates for Sale in the Land Judges' Court—Number and Acreage of—Names of Owners.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 16*, 839.

Land Question, Ireland

Conference—Printing and Circulation of Papers dealing with Land Conference and Resolution and Statement on Irish Land Purchase of Landlords Convention.
Q. Sir J. Colomb ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 9*, 93.

Land Bill.

Impossibility of Introduction at early date.
Qs. Mr. Redmond ; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 10*, 257.

Possible date of Introduction.
Q. Mr. Malcolm ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 12*, 589.

Leitrim—Land Purchase in — Gillmor's Case.

Extent of Holding purchased under terms of agreement, with money advanced by Land Commissioners—Institution of Inquiry into circumstances attending sale, proposed.
Qs. Mr. O'Dowd ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 9*, 112 ; *Mar. 11*, 385.

Wicklow—Land Purchase in—Delay in delivery of Deed of Conveyance subsequent to payment of purchase money—Case of Miss Heffernan, *Mar. 11*, 387.

Land Transfer Act

Registration of Titles—Suspension of registration of titles until formulation of scheme for facilitating registration, proposed.

Q. Mr. Remnant; A. Sir R. Finlay, *Mar. 9*, 85.

Land Valuation (Scotland) Bill

c. 1R.* *Mar. 10*, 269.

Land Values Assessment and Rating Bill

Petition in favour, *Mar. 20*, 1382.

Lansdowne, Marquess of—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs*

Macedonian Affairs—Connexion between Bulgaria and Macedonia—Probable exaggerations in accounts of outrages—Attitude of the European Powers, *Mar. 13*, 718.

Laurie, Lt.-General J. W. [Pembroke and Haverfordwest]

Local Government (Wales and Monmouthshire)—Reasons against a separate Welsh Parliament, *Mar. 18*, 1183.

Supply.

Army Estimates—Land Forces—Deficiencies in Recruiting System—Objections to Linked Battalions—Treatment of Reservists, *Mar. 11*, 419.

Navy Estimates—Pensions and Half Pay, etc.—Classes of Dockyard Men, *Mar. 18*, 1119.

Law, Mr. Bonar—*Parliamentary Secretary to Board of Trade* [Glasgow, Blackfriars]

Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway Bill—Reasons for not referring Bill to Royal Commission, *Mar. 11*, 474.

City and N. E. Suburban Electric Railway Bill—Limitations of the Royal Commission on London Traffic—Reasons in favour of Bill—Appeal for consideration by Committee, *Mar. 12*, 671.

Law, Mr. H. [Donegal, W.]

Burtonport Extension Railway—Steps towards securing Charge of Reasonable Rates and Fares on, *Mar. 19*, 1222.

Royal Irish Constabulary—Recommendations of Commission on, with regard to Pensions and Lodging Allowance—Possibility of speedily giving effect to, *Mar. 17*, 993.

Lawrence, Sir Joseph [Monmouth Boroughs]

Wales—National Museum Grant—Reasons for support of the Motion—Antiquities at Caerleon, etc., *Mar. 10*, 358.

Lawson, Mr. J. Grant—*Secretary to the Local Government Board*—[Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk]

Machinery Rating Bill—Position of the Government, *Mar. 20*, 1407.

Reasons for the Neutrality of the Government, *Mar. 20*, 1423.

Financial Considerations—Report of the Royal Commission—Popular opinion of the Bill—Probable effect on Litigation, *Mar. 20*, 1425.

Motor Cars, Registration of, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1102.

Layland-Barratt, Mr. F. [Devonshire, Torquay]

Supply—Education Vote—Voluntary Elementary Schools, *Mar. 19*, 1333.

Lee, Mr. A. [Hampshire, Fareham]

Army—Strength of—Three hundred men out of every battalion non-effective, alleged, *Mar. 9*, 98.

Postal Rates to United States—Proposed Reduction of—Reopening of Negotiations with United States Government, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 261.

Supply.

Army Estimates.

Land Forces—Defence of the War Office Policy—Objections to Army Corps Scheme—Use of the Reserve—Objections to Linked-Battalion System—Deficient Recruits—Necessity for Evidence as to the Respectability of Recruits—Physical Regulations—Suggested Remedies for Wastage in the Army, *Mar. 11*, 403.

Pay of Army—Effect of Increased Pay on Recruiting—Increase of Pay for Long Service, *Mar. 12*, 601, 644.

Reasons in favour of a New Recruiting System—Motives for Motion for Reduction, *Mar. 18*, 1155.

Training of Officers and Men—Reports of Military Education Committee—Action of the Secretary of State for War criticised—Illusory and Useless Nature of Promotion Examinations—Training of Officers and Men in a home battalion an utter impossibility under existing system—Condition of Home Battalions—Reasons for Abolition of Linked-Battalion System, *Mar. 9*, 122, 140, 145.

Civil Service Estimates—Grant for St. Louis Exhibition, *Mar. 23*, 1522.

Leese, Sir J. [Lancashire, Accrington]
Smallpox—Outbreak in Lancashire and Yorkshire—Spread of Infection by Tramps, alleged—Action of Board with regard to Arresting Spread of Disease, *Mar. 10*, 264.

Legge, Colonel H. [St. George's, Hanover Square]
Cavalry Arms.
Employment of both Rifle and Sword—Unnecessary Equipment, *Mar. 16*, 842.
Abolition of Lance, *Mar. 16*, 849.
Lance *v.* Sword—Substitution of Lance for Sword in Lancers, Dragoon Guards, and Dragoon Regiments—Reconsideration of, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 576.
Lance Practice — Withdrawal of, from Course of Training—Deprivation of Men of Lancer Regiments of Extra Pay for Increased Efficiency, *Mar. 17*, 996.
Lancers—Prizes for Lance Practice—Discontinuance of, *Mar. 12*, 576.

Leng, Sir John [Dundee]
Indian Currency—Number of Gold Coins paid into Indian Treasuries for Fiscal Payments—Number paid out for State Obligations, *Mar. 12*, 581.

Licensing Acts Amendment (Scotland) Bill
Arrangement for Interval between First and Second Reading of—Thus Facilitating Discussion of Proposals Contained therein, *Mar. 16*, 851.
Public Houses (Hours of Closing) (Scotland) Bill, *Mar. 10*, 267, 367.
Russia and Persia—Tariff Agreement—Conclusion of, *Mar. 17*, 997.
Supply—Colonial Vote — South African Affairs—Comparison of South Africa with Nervada—Remedies for forced labour problem, *Mar. 19*, 1288.
Volunteers' Bandoliers—Unsuitability of those employed during South African War—Issue of suitable arrangement, *Mar. 16*, 839.

Levy, Mr. M. [Leicestershire, Loughborough]
British South Africa—Forced labour in—Establishment of system of, alleged—Possible steps for removal of abuse, *Mar. 23*, 1440.
Coastguard Signal Stations—Names of stations at present and about to be fitted with wireless telegraphy apparatus, *Mar. 23*, 1457.
Education Schemes under new Act—Number of schemes submitted by Town Councils, returned for alteration—Case of Loughborough Town Council Scheme, *Mar. 19*, 1218.
Supply — Education Vote — Physical Training in Schools—Protest against the interference of the Board of Education with the Leicestershire County Council, *Mar. 19*, 1317, 1318, 1319.

Lee, Mr. M.—*cont.*
Vaccination.
Distress Warrants, Costs involved in execution of, Case at Melton Mowbray—Issue of instructions to Constables with view to diminishing excessive costs of executing warrants, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1220.
Treatment of persons convicted under Acts—Case of Pink and Cokin—Steps for Prevention of similar occurrence, *Mar. 9*, 82.

Lewis, Mr. J. Herbert [Flint Boroughs]
Wales — National Museum Grant — Reasons in favour of a National Storehouse for Welsh Treasures of Art and Science, *Mar. 10*, 353.

Lewis, Island of
Port of Ness Breakwater, Damages done during storm to.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 18*, 1088.
Port Ness Harbour—Publication of report on condition of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 18*, 1088.

Licences, Publicans'
Appeals against Refusals on Grounds other than those of Misconduct—Advisability of issuing advice to Justices not to appear as Respondents in such Appeals.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 18*, 1090.
Return of portion of Licence paid for the time subsequent to closing of house.
Q. Lord E. Talbot; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *Mar. 23*, 1449.
Transfers—Refusal to grant a second Transfer until expiration of a fixed period.
Q. Mr. Colston; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 17*, 991.

Licensed Premises
Internal Communication—Definition of, as occurring in Licensing Act.
Q. Mr. D. A. Morgan; *A.* Mr. Cochrane, *Mar. 23*, 1464.

Licensing Act Amendment Bill
Presentation by Earl of Wemyss, *Mar. 19*, 1214.

Licensing Acts Amendment (Scotland) Bill
Arrangement for Interval between First and Second Reading of, thus facilitating Discussion of Proposals contained therein.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 16*, 851.
Petitions Presented, *Mar. 10*, 254; *Mar. 12*, 559; *Mar. 17*, 987.

Licensing Acts Consolidation (Scotland) Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 12*, 590.

Licensing Bill
Amendment—Innkeepers' Liability Bill—Debate (H.C.) *Mar. 6*, 8.

Life Association of Scotland Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 6*, 1.

Light Load Line
Evidence taken before Committee—Distribution of to Members of Committee and such persons approved by Committee, *Mar. 9*, 62.

Light Locomotives (Ireland) Bill
l. Amendts. Rep., *Mar. 23*, 1434.

Lima Railways Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 6*, 1.

Limerick
Court of Conscience—Number of cases tried in, in 1902.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 10*, 267.
Field Artillery Batteries at, Full Equipment of.
Q. Mr. Seymour Ormesby-Gore; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 100.
Labourers' Cottages—Application of T. O'Brien for cottage and plot under Labourers Acts, Grant of, at recent Inquiry.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 10*, 266.
Post Office.
Postal and Telegraph Staffs' Grievances — Record of Irregularities committed by Staff, and consideration of in connection with granting of Annual Increments, alleged.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 9*, 113.
Vacancy for Assistant-Superintendentship — Promotion of Local Official.
Qs. Mr. Joyce; *As.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 9*, 113.
Roxboro Road Schools.
Accumulation of rents of in hands of Commissioners—amounts of, previous to inquiry by Education Endowments Commission.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 9*, 112.
Expenditure on repairs of, Legality of —Assertion by and name of Auditor — Authority for such Expenditure.
Qs. Mr. Joyce; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 11*, 384; *Mar. 23*, 1467.

Liquor Traffic
Licences refused—Return Ordered, *Mar. 17*, 989.
Scotch Whisky—Spirit made from molasses described and sold as—Employment of English Spirit for blending and bottling operations in Customs Warehouses and under supervision of Revenue Officials, alleged.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Ritchie, *Mar. 9*, 106.

Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland) Bill
Petition, *Mar. 23*, 1437.

Liverpool
Post Office—Female Staff—Salaries—Inadequacy of, alleged.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 12*, 564.
Smallpox—Number of Cases.
Q. Mr. Coghill; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 10*, 265.

Llewellyn, Mr. E. H. [Somersetshire, N,]
Supply—Army Estimates.
Training of Officers — Training of Volunteer Officers — Territorial System advocated — Importance to soldiers of the study of foreign languages—Social status of Military officers, *Mar. 9*, 161.
Volunteer Organisation — Lack of efficient officers, *Mar. 9*, 220.

Lloyd-George, Mr. [Carnarvon Boroughs]
Local Government (Wales and Monmouthshire)—Reasons in favour of union between the representatives of the Welsh County Councils and the representatives of Wales in the Imperial Parliament, *Mar. 18*, 1196.
Supply—Colonial Vote—South African Affairs—Native labour and taxation, *Mar. 19*, 1267.
Wales — National Museum Grant — Reasons for support of Motion, *Mar. 10*, 363.

Loan Societies
Abstract of Accounts presented, *Mar. 11*, 372; *Mar. 12*, 524.

Local Councils
Government Grants—Payment of—Possibility of Further Payments in respect of Residue (Beer and Spirits Duty) Grant — Comparison of this year's grants with those of last year, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *Mar. 16*, 836.

Local Government in Wales and Monmouthshire.
Debate [H.C.], *Mar. 18*, 1171.

Local Government Franchise and Representation (Extension to Companies) Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 9*, 115.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
c. Ordered, *Mar. 16*, 830.
c. 1R.* *Mar. 16*, 830.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
c. Ordered, *Mar. 16*, 830.
c. 1R.* *Mar. 16*, 830.

Local Government [Scotland] Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 12*, 590.

Local Government (Transfers of Powers) Bill
O. Mr. Caldwell, *Mar. 9*, 236.

Local Records Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 18*, 1109.

Locke, Mr. John [Devonport]
Income Tax, Alteration in Dates of Payment, *Mar. 18*, 1091.

Naval Victualling—Increased Cost under New Victualling Scheme—Increased Allowance to Pensioners in consequence, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1445.

Royal Marines—Arrangements for optional courses for Officers under new Scheme, *Mar. 15*, 732.

Shipbuilding at Devonport — Arrangements for Construction of one new Battleship at, *Mar. 13*, 1090.

Lockwood, Lieutenant-Colonel [Essex, Epping]
Explosives Factories—Increased Wages for Employees, proposed, *Mar. 17*, 994.

Sanitary Inspection—Exemption of Government Property from, Grounds for, *Mar. 23*, 1439.

Supply—Army Estimates.

Land Forces—Reasons for support of the Government, *Mar. 11*, 464.

Training of Officers—Defence of Army with regard to South African War —Deficiencies in Sandhurst curriculum — Expenses in Cavalry regiments — University candidates, *Mar. 9*, 155.

Waltham Abbey Sanitary Inspector — Exemption of Government Property from visits of—Grounds for, *Mar. 19*, 1217; *Mar. 23*, 1439.

London
Church Street, Kensington — Possible Jurisdiction of Board of Works over Erection of Houses in—Retention of Lime Trees, proposed.
Q. Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. Hayes-Fisher, *Mar. 23*, 1467.

Deaths from Starvation or accelerated by Privation—Return ordered, *Mar. 23*, 1438.

London and Globe Finance Corporation—Means for Prosecution of Mr. Whitaker Wright—Prevention of escape.
Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 11*, 383.

Purchase of Shares subsequent to Company having gone into Liquidation — Reconsideration of Decision with regard to Prosecution of Directors, proposed.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *Mar. 9*, 108.

London and North Western Railway Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 61.

London County Asylum (Receiving Houses) Bill
Withdrawal as a Private Bill.
Os. Lord Monkswell, *Mar. 12*, 521; Earl of Morley, *Mar. 12*, 522; Earl of Halsbury, *Mar. 12*, 523.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill (By Order)
Amendments and Instructions — *Debate* [H.C.], *Mar. 23*, 1545.

London County Council (Tramway and Improvements) Bill
c. Report,* *Mar. 10*, 252.
c. Ordered, *Mar. 10*, 262.
c. 1R,* *Mar. 11*, 369.

Londonderry, Marquess of, *President of Board of Education.*
Education Act, Schemes under, Number of, providing for appointment of persons nominated or recommended by Free Church Council—Policy of Board in dealing with such schemes, *Mar. 20*, 1376.

Light Locomotives (Ireland Bill)—proposed Amendments, *Mar. 20*, 1367.

Reasons in favour of the authorisation of automobile races in Ireland—Authority of the County Councils —Pecuniary advantages of the scheme, *Mar. 16*, 819, 820.

London Hydraulic Power Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 11*, 369.

London, Tilbury and Southend Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 79.
c. com. Mar. 9, 79.

London United Tramways Bill
(By Order)—*Debate* [H.C.] *on* 2R. *Mar. 19*, 1304.

Long, Colonel E. [Worcestershire, Evesham]
Supply (Army Estimates)—Training of Army Officers — Responsibility of Senior Officers for inefficiency of the juniors—Necessity for the development of Presence of Mind in all Soldiers—Lack of adequate Practising Grounds——Training of the Auxiliary Forces — Necessity for an Efficient Striking Force, *Mar. 9*, 115.

Long, Rt. Hon. Walter, *President of the Local Government Board* [Bristol, South]
Aliens.

Lunatics landed at Tilbury Docks and supported by Orsett Union Guardians, *Mar. 10*, 256.

Paupers, Number of in this country, and particularly in London, *Mar. 10*, 265.

[*cont.*

Long, Rt. Hon. Walter—*cont.*

Cremation Act—Death Certification under—Unsatisfactory system of—Introduction of Bill during present Session for purpose of carrying out recommendations of, *Mar. 17*, 999.

Education Act, Section 18 (1) (d) Powers of County Council to raise sum separably chargeable under, by issue of precept to overseers of parish chargeable—Application of County Rate Act to rate leviable for educational purposes, *Mar. 23*, 1447.

Local Government (Wales and Monmouthshire)—Lack of Adequate Reasons in favour of the Resolution, *Mar. 18*, 1189.

Motor Cars—Identification of—Introduction of Legislation with view to facilitating—proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1463.

Smallpox.

Lancashire and Yorkshire, Outbreak in—Spread of Infection by Tramps, alleged—Action of Board with regard to arresting Spread of Disease, *Mar. 10*, 264.

Liverpool—Number of Cases, *Mar. 10*, 265.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid.]

Irish Intermediate Schools, Inspection of—Diminution in number of Inspectors, alleged—Steps towards placing Inspection of Intermediate Schools on Permanent Basis, *Mar. 9*, 110.

Lough, Mr. T. [Islington, W.]

Army Works Bill—Sums required under Possible expenditure within next Financial Year, *Mar. 23*, 1457.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill—Supply of Electric Light Fittings by Borough Councils, *Mar. 23*, 1553.

Sugar and Corn Taxes—Number of Articles made liable to Customs Duties under—Number of Prosecutions for Smuggling such Articles—Amount of Penalties recovered, *Mar. 19*, 1227.

Supply.

Army Estimates.

Motion to go into Committee—Public Feeling at the Immense Amount of the Estimates—Increased Expenditure without Provision for Improved Armaments, Expenses of the Army Corps Scheme, increased Allowance for Education and Intelligence Departments—Appeal to the Government for a reduction in the Outlay.

Pay of Army—Protest against Reckless Expenditure, *Mar. 12*, 647.

Retired Pay—Protest against Discussion on the Vote, *Mar. 12*, 691.

Lough, Mr. T.—*cont.*

Supply—*cont.*

Army Estimates—*cont.*

Reason for Increase in Number of Colonels and other Officers on Half-pay, *Mar. 12*, 698.

Volunteers' Organisation—Motion for Adjournment, *Mar. 9*, 235.

Civil Service Estimates—Irish National Gallery (Excess) — Arrangements for the Keeping of Accounts, *Mar. 18*, 1112.

Navy Estimates.

Pensions, Half-Pay, etc.—Protest against present consideration of the Vote, *Mar. 18*, 1113.

Suggestion regarding Order of Votes, *Mar. 18*, 1116.

Protest against the Increased Expenditure— Departure of the Government from the Two-Power Standard—Comparison of the Estimates with those of other Powers—Return of Casualties—Vast Expenditure without Security, *Mar. 16*, 941.

Protest against size of the Estimates—*Personnel* of the Navy—Recruiting for Reserves—Appeal to Government for a Reduction, *Mar. 23*, 1470.

Non-Continuous Service in the Reserve, *Mar. 23*, 1499.

Relations with Foreign Powers, *Mar. 23*, 1497.

Amendment withdrawn, *Mar. 23*, 1501.

Salaries of Officers, etc.—Protest against enormous outlay—Negotiations with Foreign Powers advocated, *Mar. 17*, 1063.

West Indies Relief Fund—Distribution of, Amount allocated to each Colony—Principle of Distribution, *Mar. 19*, 1225.

Loughborough Education Scheme

Return of for alteration, owing to non-compliance with requirements of Act. *Q.* Mr. Levy; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 19*, 1218.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. James [Kent, Thanet]

Alien Immigration—Action of Government with regard to Landing of Aliens without Passports, *Mar. 10*, 259.

Lucas, Mr. R. [Portsmouth]

Army—Royal Artillery Commissions—University Candidates for—Standard required, Method of Selection, *Mar. 23*, 1454.

Lucas, Mr. R.—*cont.*
  Navy.
    New Ration System—Date of coming into operation, *Mar. 9*, 89.
    Nominations for—Number of Vacancies, *Mar. 19*, 1220.
    Promotions of Warrant Officers to Lieutenants—Method of Promotion under New Navy Scheme, *Mar. 9*, 89.
    Schoolmasters' Pensions — Extension of increased Chief Petty Officers' Pension to Schoolmasters, *Mar. 11*, 375.
    Warrant Officers, Promotion of, to Lieutenants under New Navy Scheme, *Mar. 13*, 732.
  Supply—Navy Estimates.
    Necessity for an Efficient Navy—Justification for Expenditure, *Mar. 23*, 1501.
    Pensions, Half-pay, etc.—Pensions of Dockyard Men, *Mar. 18*, 1118.
    Protest on behalf of Greenwich Hospital — System of Pensions — Necessity for improvement in Gunnery — Consideration of the German Navy—Attitude of the Colonies, *Mar. 16*, 955.

Lunacy
  see London County Asylum (Receiving Houses) Bill.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
  Fitzmaurice Estate—Condition of, as regards Sale to Tenants—Amount disposed of—Sale Price—Steps for disposal of further portions, *Mar. 23*, 1468.
    Limerick, Co.—Labourers' Cottages—Application of T. O'Brien for Cottage and Plot under Labourers Acts—Grant of, at recent Inquiry, *Mar. 10*, 266.

Lytton, Earl of
  Shops (Early Closing) Bill.
    Scope for regulations from the Local Authority — Initiative of the Shopkeepers, *Mar. 20*, 1358.
    Shop Assistants' Interests, *Mar. 20*, 1360.
    Objections to Bill—Limitations of its Scope—Significance of the Woolwich Election, *Mar. 12*, 556.

Lyveden, Lord
  Sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Uncle, *Mar. 17*, 985.

M'Calmont, Col, J. [Antrim, East]
  Midland and Belfast and Northern Counties Railways Bill—Reasons for support of, 2R. *Mar. 23*, 1542.

McArthur, Mr. Charles [Liverpool, Exchange]
  British and Colonial Trade—Dangers of Protection — Prosperity of England under Free Trade Policy—Injurious bounties in regard to Shipping—Exclusive territorial concessions—Reasons in favour of Free Trade within the Empire, *Mar. 17*, 1069.
  Church Discipline Bill—Reasons for abolition of Bishops' Veto, *Mar. 13*, 791, 792.

Macclesfield and District Electric Tramways Bill
  l. 2R.* *Mar. 23*, 1433.

McCrae, Mr. G. [Edinburgh, E.]
  Supply — Army Estimates — Volunteer Organisation—Appeal for fixed Regulations—Objections to Combination of outside battalions with the Army Corps—Appeal for an efficient Volunteer Transport—Inquiry on subject of Camp Allowances—Value of a large auxiliary force, *Mar. 9*, 206, 232.

Macedonia
  Affairs in — Memoranda of Madame Bakhmetiegs—Steps taken by Government to secure copies of—Circulation to Members, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 9*, 95.
  Gendarmerie—Russian Objection to employment of German Officers only in the re-organisation of Macedonian Gendarmerie.
    Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 17*, 997.
  Reforms in—Issue of information regarding progress of.
    Q. Mr. Stevenson; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 23*, 1461.
    Os. Lord Newton, *Mar. 13*, 706; Lord Bishop of Hereford, *Mar. 13*, 713; Marquess of Lansdowne, *Mar. 13*, 718; Earl Spencer, *Mar. 13*, 722; Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 23*, 1563; Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 23*, 1569; Mr. Stevenson, *Mar. 23*, 1575.

M'Fadden, Mr. E. [Donegal, E.]
  Buncrana and Cardonagh Railway—Appointment of Arbitrators in connection with—Amount Certified by, to be due and payable by the Donegal County Council on foot of the guarantee, *Mar. 9*, 113.

Machinery Rating Bill
  Debate [H.C.] *on* 2R. *Mar. 20*, 1385.

M'Kenna, Mr. [Monmouthshire, N.]
  High Pavement School, Nottingham—Transference of Scholars of, to All Saints' School, proposed—Inconveniences of such a transference to scholars—Reconsideration of decision, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 584.
  Supply—Education Vote—Action of the Board of Education at Nottingham, *Mar. 19*, 1322.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J. [Camberwell, N.]
- Education Act—Grants under, Payment of, by Instalments—Possible Continuance of Practice for year 1904-1905, *Mar. 23*, 1447.
- Employment of Children Bill—Second Reading, Possible date of, *Mar. 19*, 1232.
- Supply—Education Vote—Necessity for Improvement in the Qualifications of Teachers — Protest against New System of Physical Training as Unsuitable for Children, *Mar. 19*, 1292.

MacNeill, Mr. Swift [Donegal, South]
- Boer Prisoners.
  - Bermuda—Number of, in—Circumstances of Detention—Treatment of subsequent to Conclusion of Peace — On whose authority—Possible date of return to South Africa, *Mar. 16*, 844, 846.
  - Ceylon—Detention of, in — Number detained, having refused to take Oath of Allegiance—Ill-treatment of, alleged—Possible date of Return to South Africa, *Mar. 11*, 375 ; *Mar. 16*, 844.
  - Deportation of, to India, Ceylon, and Bermuda — Number deported—Detainment in Prison and Treatment as Common Criminals, subsequent to Proclamation of Peace, *Mar. 12*, 573.
  - India — Detention of, in — Number detained at various stations—Prolongation of Detention in hotter districts, in default of taking Oath of Allegiance, *Mar. 16*, 844, 845.
- Col. Kinloch, Case of—Issue of White Paper containing evidence, being only one part of the Transaction—Inconsistent with Statement made by Secretary of State for War, *Mar. 16*, 858.
- Cladnageragh Pier—Extension of, Steps for provision of carrying out, *Mar. 11*, 386.
- Cyprus—Taxation in—Petition of Members of Legislative Council for Relief from Heaviness of, *Mar. 18*, 1101.
- First Grenadier Guards—Evidence taken before Court of Inquiry, Undesirability of publication of, Grounds for refusal, *Mar. 12*, 571.
- London and Globe Finance Corporation, Prosecution of Mr. Whitaker Wright—Means for prevention of escape, *Mar. 11*, 383.
- Parliamentary Procedure, Point of Order—Reference to a correspondence involves the laying on the Table of the whole correspondence, *Mar. 12*, 570.
- Pilgrimages to Mecca of British Indian Pilgrims, Payment of claims for robberies by brigands while on pilgrimage—Co-operation with Netherlands Government, in working for establishment of an international police force for protection of British and Dutch subjects, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1102.

MacNeill, Mr. Swift—*cont.*
- Pretoria Education Ordinance, Increase in number of hours reserved for instruction in Dutch above those prescribed in ordinance, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1098.
- Questions in the House—Questions relative to the province of the Secretary of State for War, answered by representative of Colonial Office, *Mar. 11*, 377 ; *Mar. 12*, 574.
- Turkey, British Consular Officers in—Increase in number of, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1102.
- Vryheid, South Africa—Addition of, to Colony of Natal, alleged—Necessity of having sanction of Imperial Parliament, previous to such addition, *Mar. 16*, 847.
- Wright, Mr. Whitaker, Flight of, alleged.—Neglect of necessary precautions for prevention of—Duty of Executive to bring him to Justice, *Mar. 11*, 515 ; *Mar. 12*, 582.

MacVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, S.]
- Denmark—Agricultural Produce — Subsidisation of Steamers for carriage of, Conditions and extent of Government subsidies, *Mar. 9*, 83.
- Ex-Banbridge Postmaster—Restoration of—Present appointment, circumstances of restoration, *Mar. 12*, 589.
- Irish Fisheries, County Down—Early Closing of Fishing Season in—Injury done to fishing industry during—Inquiry with view to extension of season, proposed—Extension of Close Season between Clougher Head and Belfast Lough, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 587 ; *Mar. 18*, 1091.
- Midland and Belfast and Northern Counties Railways Bill—Reasons for rejection—Railways in Ireland—High rates charged for conveyance of goods, *Mar. 23*, 1538.
  - Attitude of Midland Railway Company, *Mar. 23*, 1540.
  - Appeal of Port and Harbour Commissioners of Londonderry, *Mar. 23*, 1541.
- Scotch Whisky — Spirit made from Molasses, described and sold as—Employment of English Spirit—For Blending and Bottling operations in Customs Warehouses and under Supervision of Revenue Officials, alleged, *Mar. 9*, 106.

Maidstone Gas Bill
- *c.* 2R * *Mar. 9*, 79.
- *c. Com.* *Mar. 9*, 79.
- Petition for additional Provision, *Mar. 20*, 1382.

Mail Service
- American Mail Service—Return Ordered, *Mar. 16*, 832.

"Maine"
American Nurses on—Refusal of South African War Medals to Female Nurses—Grounds for Refusal.
Q. Mr. Tennant; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 19*, 1221.

Malcolm, Mr. Ian [Suffolk, Stowmarket]
Africa, East — Grant of Return with reference to Concessions in, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 581.
Army Corps Manœuvres — Proposed Localities for, *Mar. 9*, 95.
Excess Troops—Pay of, under what Constitutional or Parliamentary Authority, *Mar. 11*, 377.
Irish Land Bill—Possible date of Introduction, *Mar. 12*, 589.

Malta
Soldiers' Club at—Revival of—Provision of Suitable Accommodation for—Management of.
Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 95.

Manchester
Post Office—Dissatisfaction arising from Promotion of Allowance Holders to Head Postmen's Class—To the Disregard of Seniors in the Service.
Q.. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 9*, 108.
Ship Canal—Enterprise of Municipalities, *O.* Mr. John Burns, *Mar. 16*, 983.

Manchester Corporation Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 16*, 809.
Com. Mar. 23, 1433.

Manchester Southern Tramways (Lancashire) Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 16*, 809.
Com. Mar. 23, 1433.

Mansfield, Mr. H. [Lincolnshire, Spalding]
Congo Free State—Slavery—Official reports with regard to alleged slavery in—Enforcement of regulations of Berlin Conference, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 381.
Ireland—Seed Potatoes for—Publication of names and quantities of required, so that English growers may have opportunity of tendering for supply, *Mar. 9*, 110.

Maple, Sir J. Blundell [Camberwell, Dulwich]
London County Council (General Powers) Bill—Supply of electric light fittings by Borough Councils, *Mar. 23*, 1551.
London County Council (Tramways) Bill—Objections to trams on Westminster Bridge, *Mar. 23*, 1537.

Marine Insurance Bill
[H.L.] Second Reading, *Mar. 13*, 726.
Report with Amendment, *Mar. 20*, 1375.

Marines—Royal
Arrangement of optional courses for officers under new scheme.
Q. Mr. Lockie; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13*, 732.

Market Drayton Gas Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 11*, 369.

Markham, Mr. (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield]
Denaby and Cadeby Collieries—Strike of colliers, Distress resulting from—Putting into operation of Conciliation Act, proposed, *Mar. 17*, 998.

Marlborough, Duke of
Shops (Early Closing) Bill—Reasons for support—Favourable attitude of shopkeepers and working classes generally—Appeal for help in measures conducive to the health of the community, *Mar. 12*, 550.

Maryport Harbour Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 13*, 705.

Mayo, Earl of
Soldiers Discharged without Pension—Number so Discharged since outbreak of South African War, for diseases not directly attributable to Active Service—More Thorough Medical Examination of Recruits proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1212.
Steam Boilers in Motor Cars—Increasing Employment of, Danger Arising from System of Inspection to which Boilers are Subjected, *Mar. 19*, 1212.

Meat
Meat Contracts—Substitution of Foreign for Home Grown Meat, alleged——Wording of Contract relating to—Regulations with regard to kind of Meat—Alteration of, with view to rendering terms more definite.
Q. Mr. A. Davies; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1094; *Mar. 23*, 1453.

Mecca
Pilgrimages to, of British Indian Pilgrims—Payment of Claims for Robberies by Brigands while on Pilgrimage—Co-operation with Netherlands Government, in Working for Establishment of an International Police Force for Protection of British and Dutch Subjects, proposed.
Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 18*, 1102.

Medals aud Gratuities
China—Anti-Foreign Rising—Grant of International Medal to Allied Forces in China, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 562.
South African War Medals—American Nurses on Hospital Ship "Maine"—Refusal of to Female Nurses—Grounds for Refusal.
Q. Mr. Tennant; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 19*, 1221.

Members of Parliament
Attitude of, towards matters relating to conditions of Postal Telegraph Service.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 12*, 564.

Men-of-War
Glass Balls on Mastheads—By whom purchased.
Q. Mr. Harmsworth ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 23*, 1444.

Mercantile Marine
Pensions of Master Mariners—Amount Expended on, out of Annual Income of Trinity House Corporation—Method of Application for Pensions—Conditions on which they are Granted.
Q. Lord Muskerry ; *A.* Lord Wolverton, *Mar. 9*, 77.

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill
l. Com. Mar. 9, 61.
Report,* *Mar. 12*, 521.

Metropolitan District Railway (Various Powers) Bill
c. Report,* *Mar. 10*, 251.
Ordered, *Mar. 11*, 370.
1R.* *Mar. 12*, 557.

Midland Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 80.
Com. Mar. 9, 80.

Mid Yorkshire Tramways Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 16*, 809.

Mid Yorkshire Tramways Bill
l. Com. Mar. 23, 1433.

Milford Docks Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 6*, 1.

Military Education Committee
Reports consider
Os. Colonel Long, *Mar. 9*, 115 ; Mr. Arthur Lee, *Mar. 9*, 122 ; Sir A. Hayter, *Mar. 9*, 128 ; Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 133 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Mar. 9*, 145 ; Sir Charles Dilke, *Mar. 9*, 151 ; Sir James Fergusson, *Mar. 9*, 166 ; Mr. Edmund Robertson, *Mar. 10*, 290.

Military Expeditions
Address for Return—*Mar. 12*, 560.

Military Works Act
Expenditure for year ending Mar. 31st, 1903.
Q. Mr. Buchanan ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 23*, 1454.

Military Works Bill
Possible introduction during present Session — Amount to be borrowed under.
Q. Mr. Buchanan ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 16*, 841.

Militia
Cost of.
O. Mr. Winston Churchill, *Mar. 12*, 593.
Inclusion of, in total Strength of Army—Number of Staff.
Q. Mr. Harmsworth ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 94.
Officers.
Compulsorily retired—Officers placed on Half-pay—Details with regard to, requested.
Q. Mr. Pirie ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1094.
Number of, holding "Q" and "T" Certificates, respectively.
Q. Sir G. Parker ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1095.
Position of—*Debate on Supply, Mar. 10*, 294.
Training of—*Debate* [H.C.] *on Army Estimates, Mar. 9*, 115.

Militia Ballot Bill
[H.L.]
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *Mar. 13*, 723, 724, 725, 726 ; Earl of Hardwicke, *Mar. 13*, 724, 725, 726 ; Earl Carrington, *Mar. 13*, 726.

Milk
Imported Milk — Examination of, Insufficient Number of Samples of—Result of Examination of Tested Samples.
Qs. Sir E. Strachey ; *As.* Mr. Ritchie, *Mar. 10*, 255 ; *Mar. 16*, 837.

Mines and Quarries
General Report and Statistics for 1901—Colonial and Foreign Statistics Presented, *Mar. 13*, 706, 730.

Miscellaneous Reports
Reports on Laws on Marriage and Divorce in Foreign Countries, Presented, *Mar. 12*, 524, 559.

Monkswell, Lord
London County Asylum (Receiving Houses) Bill — Reasons for Withdrawal as a Private Bill, *Mar. 12*, 521.
Shops (Early Closing) Bill—Reasons for consulting Customers' and Assistants' Opinions and Convenience, *Mar. 20*, 1351.

Moon, Mr. E. R. [St. Pancras, N.]
Lower Burma—Chief Judge of, Departure from Precedents with regard to Qualifications for post of — Grounds for Decision, *Mar. 23*, 1450.

Moore, Seaman
Imprisonment of—Revision of Sentence, proposed.
Q. Mr. Harmsworth ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 9*. 87.

Morgan, Mr. D. J. [Essex, Walthamstow]

City and North East Suburban Railway Bill—Reasons in favour of 2R.—Overcrowding on Great Eastern Railway, *Mar. 12*, 657.

Licensed Premises—Internal Communication, Definition of, as occurring in Licensing Act, *Mar. 23*, 1464.

Morgan, Mr. Lloyd [Carmarthenshire, W.]

Mydrim, Elementary School, Carmarthenshire—Non-payment of Government Grant, alleged, *Mar. 12*, 862.

Morley, Earl of—*Chairman of Committees*

London County Asylum (Receiving Houses) Bill—Reasons against a Private and for a Public Bill, *Mar. 12*, 522.

Shops (Early Closing) Bill, Point of Order, *Mar. 20*, 1348.

Motor Cars

Identification of—Introduction of legislation with view to facilitating—proposed.

Q. Dr. Farquharson; *As.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 23*, 1463.

Registration of, proposed.

Qs. Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. G. Lawson, *Mar. 18*, 1102.

Steam Boilers—Increasing employment of, Danger arising from, System of Inspection to which boilers are subjected.

Q. Earl of Mayo; *A.* Lord Wolverton, *Mar. 19*, 1212.

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill

c. 2R.* *Mar. 16* 829.

Municipal Trading

Debate [H.C] *Mar. 16*, 979.

Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, E.]

Labourers (Ireland) Act—Return, grant of, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 568.

St. Patrick's Day—Postponement of Local Government audits fixed for, *Mar. 12*, 568.

Murray, Rt. Hon. Graham—*Lord Advocate* [Buteshire]

Applecross, Ross-shire—Inconvenience arising from lack of bridge at—Action of Congested District Board with regard to construction of bridge, *Mar. 11*, 372.

Attorney-General's Fiat—Requirements previous to granting or withholding fiat to plaintiff, *Mar. 16*, 852.

Caithness, Declaration of, as Congested District—Application for, decision, *Mar. 6*, 5.

Consumption in Scotland—Provision for treatment of consumption as an infectious disease by Local Authorities, *Mar 16*, 837.

Murray, Rt. Hon. Graham—*cont.*

Death Certificates, Scotland—Introduction of legislation with regard to, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 583.

Edinburgh—Court of Session, Inadequate accommodation in, alleged, Immediate remedy of defect, *Mar. 12*, 583.

Licensing (Scotland) Acts Amendment Bill—Arrangement for interval between First and Second Reading of, thus facilitating discussion of proposals contained therein, *Mar. 16* 851.

Licensing in Scotland.

Introduction of Bill for Consolidation of Licensing Law, *Mar. 9*, 109.

Number of Burghs losing Licensing Jurisdiction under New Licensing Bill, *Mar. 9*, 87.

Port of Ness Breakwater, Lewis—Damages done to, during storm. *Mar 18*, 1088.

Port of Ness Harbour, Lewis—Publication of Report as to Condition of, *Mar. 18*, 1088.

Shetland, Foula—Failure of Oat Crop at, resulting in great Distress—Measures for Relief, *Mar. 10*, 258.

South West—Distress in, owing to present state of Congestion—Possible Action of Congested Districts Board, *Mar. 23*, 1448.

Steamer Service between Mallaig, Lochinver, etc.—Petition for Establishment of—Grant of Annual Subsidy by Congested Districts Board in Aid of, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1088.

Supply.

Civil Service Estimates—Lawlessness in Scottish Highlands—Grievances of the Crofters, *Mar. 23*, 1534, 1535.

Education Vote—Inspection of Schools in Scotland, *Mar. 19*, 1335, 1336.

Trawling.

British Trawlers in Moray Firth trawling under Norwegian Flag—Possible Action of Government, *Mar. 9*, 87.

Number of Convictions for Illegal Trawling—Names of Cruisers Assisting in Detection, Number of Convictions secured through Action of Lightermen and Coastguards respectively, *Mar. 23*, 1448.

Vaccination in Scotland—Animal Lymph, Inadequate Supply of—Establishment of Animal Vaccine Station, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1089.

Western Highland Tweed Industry—Representation of, at St. Louis Exposition, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 383.

Musical Copyright

Introduction of Measure to Amend Musical Copyright Act, proposed.

Q. Mr. J. Walton; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *Mar. 9*, 85.

Muskerry Lord
Mercantile Marine—Master Mariners—Pensions for, Amount expended on, out of Annual Income of Trinity House Corporation—Method of Applications for Pensions—Conditions on which they are Granted, *Mar 9*, 77.

Mydrim, Carmarthenshire
Elementary School — Non-payment of Government Grant, alleged.
Q. Mr. Lloyd Morgan ; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 12*, 562.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [Dublin, College Green]
Dublin Postal Sorting Office.
Promotion of Second Division Clerk to First Class Assistant Superintendent, contrary to usual Practice—Grounds for, *Mar. 16*, 856 ; *Mar. 23*, 1469.
Sorter-Tracers' Vacancies filled by Transfers, alleged — Reservation of Number of Vacancies for Postmen's Competition, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 373.
Sorters' Duties—Withdrawal of 7s. Allowanced Sorting Postmen from Certain Duties, alleged—Provision of Assistants to do their Work, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 373.
Innkeepers' Liability Bill—Obligations of the Innkeeper to supply Reasonable Accommodation for Cyclists and Others, *Mar. 6*, 22.
Ireland — Justices of the Peace — Appointment of Working Men as—Representations to Lord Chancellor with regard to these Appointments, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 91.
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturdays (Ireland) Bill — Objections to Bill—Encouragement offered by such a Measure to Bogus Clubs and Shebeens—Coercive Nature of Bill—Opposition of Public Opinion in Ireland—Drink Statistics in Proof of the Decrease of Intemperance in Ireland—Nature of Necessary Reforms, *Mar. 6*, 35, 48.
Machinery Rating Bill — Payment of Deficiency — Interests of Working Classes—Reason for Opposition, *Mar. 20*, 1428.
Telegraph Service—London Appointments—Grounds for Appointment of Two Female Technical Officers in preference to Seniors possessing equal Technical Qualifications, *Mar. 23*, 1464.
Transport of Stores to South Africa—Negotiations with Companies violating Fair Wage Resolution, alleged — Employment of British Seamen in preference to Foreigners, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 579.

Nantwich Gas Bill
l. Report,* *Mar. 12*, 520.

Nantwich Urban District Council Bill
l. Com. Mar. 9, 61.
Report, *Mar. 12*, 520.

Natal
Order for "Northern Districts Annexation Act" to lie on Table, discharged, *Mar. 9*, 62.

National School Teachers, Ireland
Assistant Teachers.
Compulsory Return of Names of Teachers giving instruction in extra subjects, *e.g.* Irish.
Q. Mr. Crean ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 12*, 567.
Promotion, Advisability of, after long service from Third to Second Grade.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 9*, 93.
Capitation Grant, Delay in payment, alleged.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 19*, 1231.
Grade Regulations — Arrangement of Teachers in their respective grades under New Regulations.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 12*, 586.
Repairs to Schools and Residences, whether obligatory on Teachers.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 9*, 92.
Salaries—Petition for inquiry into system of fixing Salaries under the New Rules—Grant of, proposed.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 9*, 111.

Naval Base
Formation of New Base at St. Margaret's Hope, Firth of Forth.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 878 ; Mr. Lough, *Mar. 16*, 946 ; Mr. Caldwell, *Mar. 16*, 969 ; Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 17*, 1010 ; Sir Fortescue Flannery, *Mar. 17*, 1026.
Rental and Extent of Land to be acquired.
Q. Mr. Black ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 18*, 1097.
Tyne, Claims of, with regard to Formation of New Naval Base—Decision.
Q. Mr. Plummer ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 9*, 83.

Naval Works Acts
Account Presented, *Mar. 11*, 371.
Expenditure under, for year ending March 31st, 1903.
Q. Mr. Buchanan ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 23*, 1445.
Provision and scope.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 17*, 1008.

Naval Works Bill
Introduction of, during present Session—Amount to be borrowed under.
Q. Mr. Buchanan ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 847.

Navy
First Lord—Earl of Selborne.
Secretary—Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.
Civil Lord—Mr. E. G. Pretyman.

Armaments.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 875.

Army Corps System, on Influence of.
Os. Lieut.-Colonel Kemp, *Mar. 12*, 646; Major Seely, *Mar. 12*, 627.

Boy Artificers:
Dissatisfaction arising from Limitation of right to sit for Examination as, to Sons of Officers of certain ranks only — Revision of Conditions, proposed.
Q. Mr. Kearley; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 10*, 259.

Training of.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 871; Mr. Gibson Bowles, *Mar. 16*, 895.

Cadetships for Executive Officers, etc., Nominations to compete for Entrance to "Britannia" for number of, by whom Granted under New Scheme.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 834.

Coaling Arrangements.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 878.

Dockyard Expense Accounts — Annual Accounts Presented, *Mar. 11*, 371.

Dockyards, Wages and Pensions of Men Employed in.
Os. Mr. Kearley, *Mar. 18*, 1117, 1119; Mr. Edmund Robertson, *Mar. 18*, 1117; Mr. Reginald Lucas, *Mar. 18*, 1118; General Laurie, *Mar. 18*, 1118; Mr. Pretyman, *Mar 18*, 1119.

Engineering Branch.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 867, 930; Mr. Gibson Bowles, *Mar. 16*, 883; Sir John Gorst, *Mar. 16*, 901; Mr. Edmund Robertson, *Mar. 16*, 907; Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 16*, 916; Sir Fortescue Flannery, *Mar. 16*, 922; *Mar. 17*, 1026; Mr. Harwood, *Mar. 16*, 977; Sir John Colomb, *Mar. 17*, 1017.

Flag List — Deficiency in Numbers of Younger Officers on.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 12*, 577.

Gunnery.
Criticism of.
Os. Mr. Kearley, *Mar. 17*, 1050; Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 17*, 1051, 1056, 1057; Mr. Seely, *Mar. 17*, 1053; Sir William Allan, *Mar. 17*, 1061.

Prize-winners—Display of Names of—Score and Nature of Gun, on lower deck of each Ship, proposed.
Q. Mr. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 23*, 1443.

Navy—*cont.*

Greenwich Hospital—Pensions, Extension of Special, to Fifty Chief Petty Officers, proposed.
Q. Mr. S. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 23*, 1444.

King's Regulations—Changes in, Recommendation for sanction of, by Order in Council.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 848.

Lord Goschen's Committee—Recommendations of—Laying on Table of Report previous to Discussion on Navy Estimates, proposed.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 12*, 577.

Mechanicians, Rating of.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 870.

Medical Service — Promotion and Pay, Improvement in respect to, proposed.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 23*, 1444.

Mercantile Marine, Constitution of.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 23*, 1489; Mr. Runciman, *Mar. 23*, 1493, 1496; Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 23*, 1495.

Nominations for—Number of Vacancies.
Q. Mr. R. Lucas; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 19*, 1220.

Oil Fuel, Storage of—Immediate Carrying out of Arrangements for Provision of, or postponement of, until further Trials have been made with Oil-fuel.
Q. Mr. D. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 848.

Pay.
Officers, Men and Boys — Pay of, *Debate* [H.C.] *on Supply*, *Mar. 17*, 1007; Resolution Reported, *Mar. 18*, 1110.

Plumbers—Decision with regard to Proposed increase of Pay of Plumbers, having received no rise for thirty-five years.
Q. Mr. Kearley; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 23*, 1442.

Pensions.
Chief Petty Officers' Pensions.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 870.

Debate on Supply [C.] *Mar. 18*, 1113.

Greenwich Hospital, *see* that title.

Schoolmasters, Increased Pension of Chief Petty Officers, inclusive of.
Q. Mr. R. Lucas; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 11*, 375.

Personnel, Criticism of.
Os. Mr. Lough, *Mar. 23*, 1472; Sir John Colomb, *Mar. 23*, 1506; Mr. Austin Taylor, *Mar. 23*, 1509.

Rations, *see* subheading Victualling.

Navy—*cont.*
- Reserve.
  - Recruiting for.
    - *Os.* Mr. Lough, *Mar. 23*, 1472; Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 23*, 1489; Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 23*, 1496.
  - Report Presented, *Mar. 9*, 63, 81.
  - Royal Fleet Reserve.
    - *Os.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 863; *Mar. 23*, 1498.
  - Stokers, Reserve of.
    - *O.* Mr. Kearley, *Mar. 23*, 1511.
- Royal Marines.
  - *Os.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 871; Mr. Gibson Bowles, *Mar. 16*, 892; Mr. Edmund Robertson, *Mar. 16*, 907; Mr. Kearley, *Mar. 16*, 927.
- Royal Yacht—Service on, Practice with regard to Promotion of Officers Subsequent to—Continuance of Practice.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 834.
- Schoolmasters.
  - Pensions—Extension of Increased Chief Petty Officers' Pension to Schoolmasters.
    - *Q.* Mr. R. Lucas; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 11*, 375.
  - Promotion of—Extension of Privileges of Promotion granted to other ranks of Naval Warrant Officers.
    - *Q.* Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 23*, 1442.
- Seamen, Imprisonment of—Case of R. Moore—Revision of Sentence, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 9*, 87.
- Shipbuilding.
  - *O.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 872.
- Submarines—Necessity for Experiments.
  - *Os.* Mr. Harwood, *Mar. 16*, 976; Mr. Yerburgh, *Mar. 17*, 1036.
- Training of Officers and Men.
  - Memorandum on—Omission of Signatures of Commissioners, with exception of one — Reason for Omission.
    - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 847.
- Victualling.
  - Improved Scale of Rations, Accompanied by Improved System of Cooking and Serving Food.
    - *Q.* Mr. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 23*, 1443.
  - Increased Cost, under new Victualling Scheme—Increased Allowance to Pensioners in consequence, proposed.
    - *Q.* Mr. Lockie; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 23*, 1445.

Navy—*cont.*
- Victualling—*cont.*
  - New Ration System—Date of coming into Operation.
    - *Q.* Mr. R. Lucas; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 9*, 89.
  - Vote, Discussion on.
    - *Os.* Mr. Kearley, *Mar. 17*, 1064; Mr. A. Balfour, *Mar. 17*, 1065.
- Victualling Yard Manufacturing Accounts,—Annual Accounts Presented, *Mar. 11*, 371.
- Volunteer System.
  - *O.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 864.
- Warrant Officers.
  - Promotion of.
    - *Os.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 16*, 869; *Mar. 17*, 1050; Mr. Edmund Robertson, *Mar. 16*, 925; Sir Fortescue Flannery, *Mar. 16*, 925; Mr. Kearley, *Mar. 16*, 928; Sir John Colomb, *Mar. 17*, 1017.
  - Promotion of,—to lieutenants under new Navy Scheme.
    - *Q.* Mr. R. Lucas; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 9*, 89; *Mar. 13*, 732.

Navy Estimates
- Annual Statement (Mr. Arnold-Forster) *Mar. 16*, 862; *Debate* [H.C.] *Mar. 23*, 1470.
- Half Pay, Reserved and Retired Pay (£784,300), *Com. Mar. 18*, 1113; Report, *Mar. 23*, 1514.
- Men and Boys—Number of (127,100), *Com. Mar. 16*, 978.
- Pensions, Civil and Gratuities—£350,100, *Com. Mar. 18*, 1117; Report, *Mar. 23*, 1514.
- Wages of Officers, Seamen, and Boys, Coastguard and Royal Marines, (£6,312,800), *Mar. 17*, 1007; Report, *Mar. 18*, 1110.

Navy League
- Canadian Branches of the.
  - *Os.* Mr. Yerburgh, *Mar. 17*, 1021; Sir Robert Reid, *Mar. 17*, 1021.

Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 80.
- *c. Com. Mar. 9*, 80.
- Report Ordered, *Mar. 18*, 1085.
- Return Presented, *Mar. 19*, 1216.

New Members Sworn — Parliamentary Bye-Elections
- Crooks, Mr. W., for Borough of Woolwich, *Mar. 16*, 860.
- Devlin, Mr. C. R., for Borough of Galway, *Mar. 13*, 730.
- Hutchinson, Mr. C. F., M.D., for County of Sussex (Eastern or Rye Division), *Mar. 19*, 1234.

New Writs—Parliamentary Bye-Elections
Fermanagh, North, *Mar. 6*, 3.
Surrey—County of (North-Western or Chertsey Division), *Mar 13*, 730.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 80.
c. Com. Mar. 9, 80.

Newton, Lord
Macedonian Affairs—Attitude of Turkish Government – Action of Bulgarian Revolutionary Committees—Necessity for Efficient Administration, *Mar. 12*, 706.

Nolan, Colonel [Galway, N.]
Flogging—Grant of Return, relative to, *Mar. 12*, 573.
Labourers Act in Galway, Unexpended Balances under, *Mar. 18*, 1092.

Norman, Mr. H. [Wolverhampton]
Committees and Commissions, List of subjects under investigation of, at present time, *Mar. 19*, 1222.
Contracts for Agricultural Implements for South Africa—Proportion of, given to British and Foreign Tenderers, respectively, *Mar. 20*, 1385.
Frauds—Legislation facilitating prosecution of persons charged with publication of fraudulent balance sheets—Possible introduction of, *Mar. 12*, 582.

North Cheshire Tramways Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 16*, 809.
Com. Mar. 23, 1433.

North Eastern Railway Bill
c 2R.* *Mar. 18*, 1085.

North Middlesex Gas Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 80.
Com. Mar. 9, 80.

North's Navigation Collieries Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 61.

North Wales Sees
Transfer of patronage from North Wales Sees to those of South Wales—Action of Ecclesiastical Commission of 1861—Inconveniences arising from practice—Retransfer of benefices alienated from North Wales, proposed.
Q. Lord Stanley of Alderley; *A.* Earl Stanhope, *Mar. 9*, 63.

North Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill
l. Com. Mar. 9, 61.

Norton, Captain [Newington, W.]
Army Remount Department — Employment of retired officers of Veterinary Department as purchasing officers in, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1097.
Army Veterinary Officers—Pay, improvements in—Possible date of introducing, *Mar. 18*, 1097.

Norton, Captain—*cont.*
Customs Watchers—Annual Increments—Grant of, to one-fourth of Watchers—Grounds for distinction, *Mar. 18*, 1089.
Lance *v.* Sword—Greater efficiency of former, alleged, *Mar. 16*, 842.
Supply—Army Estimates—Pay, Allowances, etc.—Status, pay, etc., of the Officers of the Army Veterinary Department — Request for immediate inquiry into the matter, *Mar. 18*, 1165.
Retired Pay, etc.—Inclusion of Indian Officers, *Mar. 18*, 1171.

Nottingham High Pavement School
Inadequate accommodation for scholars, under new rules—Transfer of scholars to All Saints National School, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Grant; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 10*, 265.
Transference of Scholars of to All Saints School, proposed — Inconveniences of such a transference to scholars—Reconsideration of decision, proposed.
Qs. Mr. McKenna; *As.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 12*, 584.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill
l. Com. Mar. 9, 61.

O'Brien, Mr. K. [Tipperary, Mid.]
Ireland.
Killea—Disturbances at—Unauthorised action of Police during—Result of Inquiry into affair, *Mar. 16*, 855.
Templemore—Disturbances at — Investigation into—Completion and result of, *Mar. 23*, 1469.

O'Brien, Mr. Patrick [Kilkenny]
Conditions of Postal Telegraph Service—Reference of Matters relating to, to Members of Parliament, *Mar. 12*, 564.
Kilkenny Post Office—Non-delivery of Letters on Sunday—Arrangements for Sunday delivery and Collection, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 565.
Liverpool Post Office — Female Staff—Salaries, Inadequacy of, alleged, *Mar. 12*, 564.

O'Connor, Mr. James [Wicklow, West]
Estates for Sale in Land Judges' Court—Number and acreage of, Names of Owners, *Mar. 16*, 839.
Innkeepers' Liability Bill—Reasons for general support of Bill—Appeal for division, *Mar.* 6, 24.
Land Purchase in Co. Wicklow—Delay in delivery of Deed of Conveyance, subsequent to payment of Purchase Money—Case of Miss Hefferman, *Mar. 11*, 387.

[*cont.*

O'Connor, Mr. James—*cont.*
- Phœnix Park, Dublin — Destruction of Trees in, during gale—Sale of Timber and Replantation of devastated area, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 388.
- Rathmines Police Rate—Increase of—To what Cause due — Application of Surplus to what fund, *Mar. 11*, 386.

O'Doherty, Mr. William [Donegal, North]
- Ancient Monument at Greenan, Londonderry — Arrangement between Proprietor and Commissioners of Public Works with regard to, *Mar. 18*, 1091.
- Buncrana Barracks—Delay in Erection, alleged, *Mar. 17*, 994.
- Lough Swilly—Improvement of Boat Slips on, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1093.
- Midland and Belfast and Northern Counties Railways Bill—Attitude of Port and Harbour Commissioners of Londonderry—Commission for regulation of Irish Traffic—Reasons in favour of Bill, *Mar. 23*, 1540.
- West African Railways.
  - Constitution of—Payment of Commission to Shelford and Son, *Mar. 6*, 5.
  - Uganda Railway.
    - Crown Agents' Commission—Allocation of, to what purpose, *Mar. 6*, 5.
    - Engineers—Pay of Commission to, *Mar. 6*, 7.
    - Material for—Date of Purchase of, Price and Firms from whom it was Purchased, *Mar. 9*, 84.

O'Donnell, Mr. Thomas [Kerry, W.]
- Irish National School Teachers.
  - Repairs to Schools and Residences obligatory on. *Mar. 9*, 92.
  - Salaries of—Petition for Inquiry into System of fixing Salaries under the new Rules—Grant of, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 111.
  - Transfer of Teachers of high classification and long service from third to second grade, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 93.
- Irish Telegraph Service — Telegraphic errors, involving loss to Merchants—Compensation for, *Mar. 10*, 262.

O'Dowd, Mr. John [Sligo, S.]
- Leitrim—Land Purchase in — Gillmor's Case—Extent of Holding purchased under Terms of Agreement with Money advanced by Land Commission, *Mar. 9*, 112.
  - Institution of Inquiry into Circumstances of Case, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 385.

O'Kelly, Mr. C. [Mayo, N.]
- Midland and Belfast and Northern Counties Railways Bill—Reasons for Support of 2R.—Vindication of the Irish County Councils, *Mar. 23*, 1542.
- Swinford Seed Loan—Claim of Commissioners of Works in connection with interest on loan under Seed Supply and Potato Spraying Act—Cancelling of Claim, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 111.

Old Bridewell Burying Ground Bill
- *l. Com. Mar. 10*, 237.
- Report,* *Mar. 12*, 520.

Oldham Corporation Bill
- *l. Com. Mar. 9*, 61.

O'Mara, Mr. James [Kilkenny, South]
- Army—First Grenadier Guards—Flogging of Drummer-boy—Circumstances attending occurrence—Means for Prevention of Practice, *Mar. 16*, 841 ; *Mar. 23*, 1454.
- Afforestry in Ireland—Consideration by Irish Board of Agriculture of recommendations of Committee on British Forestry, with view to promoting, *Mar. 18*, 1104.
- Bank Holidays (Ireland) Bill, *Mar. 10*, 366.
- Irish Quit Rents—Proportion of sum received annually as Rents, Spent in Ireland, *Mar. 18*, 1105.

Orkney
- Telegraphic Communication — Severance of, with Westray, Orkney—Efforts for speedy restoration of.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Wason ; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 11*, 373.

Ormsby-Gore, Mr. Seymour [Lincolnshire, Gainsborough]
- Field Artillery Batteries at Limerick—Full Equipment of, *Mar. 9*, 100.
- Portuguese Import Duties — Representations with regard to Proposed Duties on Import of British Machinery, *Mar. 23*, 1462.
- "Russell," H.M.S.—Machinery—Nature of Defects in—Causing delay in joining Mediterranean Fleet, *Mar. 11*, 379.
- Volunteers—Officers' Resignations—Number of, since May, 1902, *May 6*, 8.

Orr-Ewing, Mr. C. L. [Ayr Burghs]
- Aden—Condition of Barracks—Report on —Possibility of improvement of, *Mar. 9*, 86.
- Range Finders — Result of Trials of — Statement, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1457.

Osborne Naval College
- Character of—Possible relation to Dartmouth Naval College, Accommodation, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 23*, 1458.

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. P. J. [Limerick, W.]
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturdays (Ireland) Bill — Reasons for closing public-houses at 9 p.m. on Saturdays —Support of Bill in interests of working classes, and of the assistants in public-houses, *Mar. 6*, 32.

O'Shee, Mr. J. J. [Waterford, West]
- Lismore Workhouse Mastership—Institution of Legal Proceedings against Board of Guardians, for retaining Mr. Mr. G. M'Donald as Master of Workhouse, *Mar. 16*, 854.
- Urban Districts Return—Grant of, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 91.

Outdoor Relief (Pensioners) Bill
- c. 1R.* *Mar. 11*, 390.

Owen, Mr. Humphreys A. C. [Montgomeryshire]
- Machinery Rating Bill—Reasons for Opposition to the Bill—Question of shifting incidence of the rates, *Mar. 20*, 1421.

Padaiyachi, Veerabadra
- Petition for Inquiry into Case of, *Mar. 20*, 1382.

Parker, Sir Gilbert [Gravesend]
- Canadian Naval Reserve, Establishment of, Independent of Imperial Authority —Action of British Government, *Mar. 17*, 996.
- Officers of Militia, Yeomanry, Volunteers, Number of, Holding "Q" and "T" Certificates, respectively, *Mar. 18*, 1095.
- South African War Medals—King's Medal, Conditions of Eligibility for, Apparent Inconsistency of Awards, *Mar. 16*, 842.
- Supply — Army Estimates — Volunteer Organisation — Connection of the Volunteer System with the Army Corps Scheme—Confusion of Principles Represented by the Volunteer System in its present condition—Failure of Compulsory Camps — Severity of Musketry Regulations — Insufficient Practising Ranges — Education of Officers—Objections to the Combination of Regulars and Volunteers—Plea for the Organisation of Volunteers as Home Defence — Colonial Volunteers, *Mar. 9*, 186, 202, 212.

Parliament
- House of Commons—Hours of Meeting, Proposal for Members to meet at Two o'Clock, instead of Two-thirty, on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and for Termination of Questions to take place at 3.25, instead of 2.55.
  - *Qs.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 11*, 388.
- House of Lords—Calendar of Manuscripts Presented, *Mar. 19*, 1216.

Parliament *cont.*
- Post Office Officials as Candidates for—Extension of Privilege enjoyed by Military and Naval Officers of being placed on half-pay for purpose of seeking election to Parliament, to Post Office Officials, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. T. Bayley; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 19*, 1219.

Parliamentary Franchise
- Petition for Extension to Women, *Mar. 9*, 80.

Parliamentary Procedure
- New Rules—Supply to come before Bill under.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 19*, 1234.
- Point of Order.
  - Duty of Minister to Lay on the Table Documents asked for by Honourable Members, Provided such a Course of Action is Conducive to Public Interest.
    - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 12*, 570.
  - Reference to a Correspondence Involves the Laying on the Table of the whole Correspondence.
    - *Q.* Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 12*, 570.
- Rules of the House.
  - Violation of — Writing of Absent Members' Names on Tickets by Present Member, in order to secure them places, alleged, *Mar. 9*, 78.

Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act
- Orders in Council Presented, *Mar. 20*, 1341, 1383.

Peel, Mr. W. R. [Manchester, S.]
- South African Shipping Ring—Invitations for Tenders from Firms outside Shipping Conference—Names of Firms so invited, *Mar. 19*, 1224.
- Supply—Colonial Vote — South African Affairs—White Labour in Mines—Reasons against Importation of Native Labour from Uganda—Coolie Labour from India—Influence of the Mines on the Prosperity of the Transvaal, *Mar. 19*, 1254, 1255.

Pemba
- Liberation of Slaves in—Recommendation to Sultan's Government for Abolition of Regulations with regard to Payment of Compensation, in order to facilitate.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. W. Wilson; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 18*, 1089.

Penal Servitude Acts
- Conditional Licence—Presented, *Mar. 16*, 810, 832; *Mar. 19*, 1213; *Mar. 18*, 1087.

Penrhyn Quarry Dispute
- Settlement of—Steps to be taken under Conciliation Act, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 16*, 850.

Percy, Earl [Kensington, S.]
Boer Prisoners in India—Harsh Treatment of, Reason for, and Number subjected to, *Mar. 9*, 101.

Perks, Mr. [Lincolnshire, Louth]
Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway Bill—Reasons for proceeding with Measure as a General Powers Bill, *Mar. 11*, 474.

Permit Office
Abolition as unnecessary.
O. Lord Stanley, *Mar. 12*, 594.

Persia
British and Russian Influence in—Establishment of Definite understanding as to Action and Influence of Great Britain and Russia in Persia—Communication with regard to—To be laid on the Table.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 9*, 104.
Russia and Persia, Tariff Agreement—Conclusion of.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 17*, 997.

Petroleum Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 19*, 1234.

Physical Training
Scotland.
Os. Mr. Shaw-Stewart, *Mar. 19*, 1316.
see also Education.

Pilkington, Lt.-Colonel, Richard [Lancashire, Newton]
Supply—Army Estimates.
Training of Officers—Necessity for continuance of Education on the part of an officer after joining his regiment, *Mar. 9*, 176.
Volunteer Organisation—Obligations to Royal Commission on score of delay—Necessity for convenient Shooting-ranges—Connection of Volunteer Battalions with Regulars—Lack of consideration shown by War Office to Volunteers, *Mar. 9*, 217.

Pirie, Mr. D. V. [Aberdeen, N.]
Aberdeen, New Post Office—Possible length of time required for completion of—Grant of further Supplementary Estimate, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1230.
Army Commissions — Grant of Return in respect of, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1223.
Army Officers.
Compulsorily Retired — Circumstances of Retirement—Number of Officers placed on Half-pay—Similar details for Militia and Volunteers, requested, *Mar. 18*, 1094.

Pirie, Mr. D. V.—*cont.*
Army Officers—*cont.*
Half-pay—Officers on.
Increase of, in 1903–1904, compared with 1902–1903—Explanation requested, *Mar. 17*, 995.
Eligible for re-Employment — Number of, Compulsorily placed on half-pay list—Possible re-Employment of, *Mar. 18*, 1095.
Totals for half-pay required for Officers eligible for employment—Percentage of sums, also that of Non-effective Vote to Army Estimates, *Mar. 16*, 140.
Removal — Reasons in favour of settling Military Cases before a Military Tribunal without discussion by House of Commons—Evils of outside influence interfering with War Office — Jealousy between India and British Military Schools—Reasons in favour of Courts-Martial—Objection to Courts of Inquiry—Cases of Colonel Kinloch, General Buller, and others, *Mar. 11*, 475.
Answers to Criticism, *Mar. 11*, 496, 497.
Army Staff Service—Medical examination of Officers previous to appointments on staff, and compulsory return to regimental duty after five years' staff service—Exceptions to regulations, *Mar. 17*, 996.
First Grenadier Guards Scandal—Refusal to grant Court-Martial—Reconsideration of Decision, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 570.
Indian Army, Reliefs for — Dates of Embarkation of, *Mar. 17*, 994.
Supply—Army Estimates—Retired Pay—Abuses of Non-Effective Vote — Increase in number of Lieutenant-Colonels and Colonels on Half-Pay, *Mar. 12*, 686, 697, 698.
Motion to report progress, *Mar. 12*, 691.

Plummer, Mr. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
Naval Base, Establishment of New—Decision with regard to Claims of the Tyne, *Mar. 9*, 83.

Plymouth and Stonehouse Gas Bill
l. Report,* *Mar. 12*, 520.
Report with Amendments, *Mar. 23*, 1433.

Police
Sale of Stray Dogs by—Payment of Dog Tax by Purchasers, previous to taking possession of Dog, proposed.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 23*, 1450.

Police and Sanitary Committee
Nomination of by Select Committee Ordered — Powers of Committee, *Mar. 23*, 1436.

Police and Sanitary Regulation Bills
Committee on — Non-appointment of during past two years.
Q. Mr. D. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 13*, 732.

Polling Districts
West Riding of County of York—Order altering Polling Districts in, Presented, *Mar. 20*, 1341, 1383.

Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill
l. Com. Mar. 9, 61.

Poor Law Superannuation (Ireland) Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 9*, 115.

Poor Law Officers' Superannuation (Scotland) Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 12*, 590.

Poor Prisoners' Defence Bill
c. Ordered, *Mar. 12*, 703.
c. 1R.* *Mar. 12*, 704.

Port of London Bill
Possible date of introduction—Taking of Second Reading before Easter.
Q. Sir. F. Dixon-Hartland; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 16*, 849.

Portsmouth, Earl of
Shops (Early Closing) Bill—Number of shopkeepers to be consulted, *Mar. 20*, 1352.

Portsmouth Harbour
Swing Bridge—Substitution of for permanent bridge, proposed—Steps to procure abandonment of proposal.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 9*, 100.

Portuguese Import Duties
Representations with regard to proposed duties on import of British Machinery.
Q. Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 23*, 1462.

Post Office
Dewsbury Post Office—Improved Sanitary Accommodation—Action with regard to acquirement of new premises in view of overcrowding at present premises.
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 23*, 1439.
Ireland.
Ballinhassig Post Office—Inconvenient situation of—Unsatisfactory appointment to postmastership, alleged — Remedy of alleged grievance, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Crean; *As.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 16*, 857.

Post Office—*cont.*
Ireland—*cont.*
Castletown Postmistress — Appointment of, person responsible for.
Qs. Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 12*, 588.
Dublin Sorting Office.
Promotion of Second Division clerk to first class assistant superintendent, contrary to usual practice—Grounds for.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 16*, 856.
Sorter's Duties—Withdrawal of 7s. allowanced sorting postmen from certain duties, alleged—Provision of assistants to do their work, proposed.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain *Mar. 11*, 373.
Sorter-Tracers' vacancies filled by transfers, alleged—Reservation of number of vacancies for postmen's competition, proposed.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 11*, 373.
Ex-Banbridge Postmaster, Restoration of — Present appointment, circumstances of restoration.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 12*, 589.
Kilkenny—Non-delivery of letters on Sunday at—Arrangements for Sunday delivery and collection, proposed.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 12*, 565.
Limerick.
Postal and Telegraph Staffs' Grievances—Record of Irregularities Committed by Staff and Consideration of, in connection with Granting of Annual Increments, alleged.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 9*, 113.
Vacancy for Assistant Superintendentship — Promotion of Local Official.
Qs. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 9*, 113.
Lurgan Post Office—Possible Date of Erection of.
Q. Colonel Saunderson; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 16*, 838.

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*
  Ireland—*cont.*
    Telegraphic Service—Telegraph Errors, involving Loss to Merchants—Compensation for.
      Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 10*, 262.
  Liverpool—Female Staff Salaries—Inadequacy of, alleged.
    Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 12*, 564.
  Manchester—Dissatisfaction Arising from Promotion of Allowance Holders to Head Postmen's Class—to the disregard of Seniors in the Service.
    Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 9*, 108.
  Members of Parliament—Reference of Matters relating to Conditions of Postal Telegraph Service, to.
    Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 12*, 564.
  Officials as Candidates for Parliament—Extension of Privilege enjoyed by Military and Naval Officers of being placed on Half Pay for purpose of Seeking Election to Parliament—to Post Office Officials, proposed.
    Q. Mr. T. Bayley; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 19*, 1219.
  Postal Facilities on the Continent—Advisability of Securing Similar Advantages for this Country, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Toulmin; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 19*, 1219.
  Postal Order System — Extension to Colonies, proposed.
    Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 18*, 1104.
  Postal Rates.
    Advisability of Entering into Negotiations to Secure Advantages enjoyed by European Nations for English Commercial Firms, proposed.
      Q. Mr. Toulmin; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 17*, 999.
    Low Rates in Germany — Arrangements for placing British Merchants on equal footing with Germans, proposed.
      Q. Mr. Stuart Samuel; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 19*, 1229.
    United States—Proposed Reduction of Postal Rates to Re-opening of Negotiations with United States Government, proposed.
      Q. Mr. A. Lee; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 10*, 261.
  Returns of Post Offices on Licensed Premises, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 19*, 1230.
  Wages—Low Rate of—Statement of Mr. Justice Phillimore—Possible Action for Improvement of.
    Q. Mr. Keir Hardie; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 19*, 1229.

Post Office Savings Bank Funds
  Return Presented, *Mar. 16*, 831.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]
  Ballylaneen—Extra Police at—Reason for Reinforcement—Cost of, and to whom charged, *Mar. 16*, 838.

Preston and Horwich Tramways Bill
  l. 2R.* *Mar. 16*, 809.
  Com. Mar. 23, 1433.

Pretoria
  Education Ordinance—Increase in Number of Hours Reserved for Instruction in Dutch above those Prescribed in Ordinance, proposed.
    Qs. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *As.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 18*, 1098.

Pretyman, Mr. E. G.—*Civil Lord of the Admiralty* [Suffolk, Woodbridge]
  Fleet, Increase of—Committee to Report on—Names of Members of—Decision with regard to Establishment of New Naval Base in Firth of Forth, *Mar. 12*, 578.
  Naval Plumbers—Rates of Pay—Decision with regard to Proposed Increase of Pay of Plumbers, having received no rise for thirty-five years, *Mar. 23*, 1442.
  Naval Schoolmasters, Promotion of—Extension of privileges of promotion granted to other ranks of Naval Warrant Officers, *Mar. 23*, 1442.
  Naval Works Acts, Expenditure under, for year ending March 31st, 1903, *Mar. 23*, 1445.
  New Naval Base, Proposed establishment of at St. Margaret's Hope—Extent and rental of land to be acquired for, *Mar. 18*, 1097.
  Special Greenwich Hospital Pensions, Extension of, to fifty Chief Petty Officers, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1444.
  Supply—Navy Estimates.
    Accounts of Naval Works Bill, *Mar. 23*, 1471.
    Greenwich Hospital Funds—Justice of granting pensions to seamen, *Mar. 16*, 966.
    Pensions, Half-Pay, &c.—Pensions of Dockyard Labourers, *Mar. 18*, 1119.
    Salary of Officers, &c.—Reasons for increase in Works Vote, *Mar. 17*, 1011.
  Training Ship, Establishment of, at Great Yarmouth, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1223.

Prevention of Corruption Bill
  Debate [H.L.] *on* 2R. *Mar. 10*, 237.
  Expediency of pressing forward Bill.
    Q. Mr. Channing; *A.* Mr. A. Balfour, *Mar. 11*, 389.
  (House in Committee)—*Debate* [H.L.], *Mar 20*, 1368.

Prevention of Cruelty to Children (Amendment) Bill
l. 1R.* *Mar. 17*, 986.

Prevention of Pollution of Rivers and Streams Bill
Petition in favour, *Mar. 23*, 1437.

Price, Mr. R. J. [Norfolk, E.]
Adulterated Baking Powder—Case of Norwich shopkeeper — Remittal of part of fine, proposed, *Mar. 17*, 992.

Private Banks
Balance Sheets—Introduction of legislation enforcing publication of.
Q. Sir J. Joicey; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 16*, 858.

Private Bill Committees
Excuses of Members from serving on, on ground of private profession—Number of cases and number of excuses accepted.
Q. Mr. D. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Halsey, *Mar. 19*, 1225.

Private Bill Procedure
Introduction of legislation with view to curtailing work of Private Committees and lessening expense of promoting Private Bills.
Q. Mr. Brigg; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 13*, 731.

Private Business
Recommendations of Select Committee on —Steps for carrying into effect.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 11*, 389.

Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act
Report from Committee agreed to, *Mar. 12*, 526.

Privy Council
Church Discipline, Powers regarding.
Os. Mr. Cripps, *Mar. 13*, 746; Mr. Lawson Walton, *Mar. 13*, 756; Mr. Vicary Gibbs, *Mar. 13*, 764.

Pryce-Jones, Lieut.-Colonel [Montgomery Boroughs]
Local Government (Wales and Monmouthshire)—Reasons against asking Parliament for further powers, when those already yielded are neglected, *Mar. 18*, 176.
Attitude of the Welsh County Councils, *Mar. 18*, 1177.
Rural and Urban powers in conflict, *Mar. 18*, 1179.
Proportions of rural and urban representatives, *Mar. 18*, 1192.

Public Accounts
Army Votes—Treasury Minute Presented, *Mar. 19*, 1216.
Navy Votes—Treasury Minute Presented, *Mar. 23*, 1438.

Public Accounts Committee
First Report Presented, *Mar. 13*, 807.

Public Accounts Committee
Election of, *Mar. 11*, 390.
Fifteen Members to Constitute, *Mar. 10*, 269.
Postponement of Nomination of Members, proposed (Sir C. Dilke), *Mar. 10*, 269.

Public Houses (Hours of Closing) (Scotland) Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 11*, 367.
O. Sir John Leng, *Mar. 10*, 367.

Public Offices (Acquisition of Site) Act
Account Presented, *Mar. 10*, 254.

Public Petitions Committee
Report (first) Presented, *Mar. 11*, 390.

Public Records
Admiralty Department Records, of insufficient Value to warrant Preservation in Public Record Office—List of, Presented, *Mar. 19*, 1211.

Public Worship Regulation Act
Representation made under, to Bishop of Rochester—Reason for Omission of, in Return.
Q. Mr. H. Johnstone; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 20*, 1383.

Public Worship Regulation and Church Discipline
Address for Return, *Mar. 11*, 372.
Return Presented, *Mar. 11*, 516.

Queen Anne's Bounty
Annual Report Presented, *Mar. 10*, 237, 254.

Questions in the House
Questions addressed to the Secretary of State for War, answered by the Postmaster-General on behalf of the Colonial Office—Speaker's Ruling thereon.
Qs. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 11*, 377; *Mar. 12*, 574.

Railway Bills
Return ordered, *Mar. 12*, 560.
Presented, *Mar. 13*, 729.

Railways
Agricultural Produce, Carriage of.
Os. Mr. Spear, *Mar. 19*, 1339; Sir E. Strachey, *Mar. 23*, 1520; Mr. Hanbury, *Mar. 23*, 1524; Sir W. Foster, *Mar. 23*, 1527.
Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway Bill (by Order), 2R. *Mar. 11* 471.
Os. Mr. Griffith Boscawen, *Mar. 12*, 677; Mr. Skewes-Cox, *Mar. 12*, 679; Mr. Vicary Gibbs, *Mar. 12*, 679.

[*cont.*

Railways—*cont.*

City and North-East Suburban Electric Railway Bill (by Order), 2R. *Mar. 12*, 657.

City and South London Railway Bill.
Os. Mr. Griffith Boscawen, *Mar. 12*, 680, 681; Mr. Cohen, *Mar. 12*, 680; Mr. John Burns, *Mar.* 12, 681.

Great Eastern, Overcrowding on.
Os. Mr. D. J. Morgan, *Mar. 12*, 661; Mr. Courtenay Warner, *Mar. 12*, 674.

Midland and Belfast and Northern Counties Railways Bill (by Order)—*Debate on*, 2R. *Mar. 23*, 1537.

Uganda.
see that title.

Randles, Mr. John S. [Cumberland, Cockermouth]

Army Officers' Education—Inclusion of Provision in New Regulations with regard to promotion of qualified non-commissioned Officers to commissioned rank, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 568.

Range Finders

Result of Trials of—Statement, proposed.
Q. Mr. Orr-Ewing; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 23*, 1457.

Rasch, Major I. C. [Essex, Chelmsford]

Supply—Army Estimates.

Land Forces—Relative importance of Army and Navy—Objections to South Africa as a Station for Troops—Reasons against reducing the Numbers in the Army, *Mar. 11*, 465.

Training of Officers—Deficiencies in Sandhurst Curriculum—Injustice of placing a Premium on University Training — Expenses of Cavalry Regiments, *Mar. 9*, 149.

Reciprocity Treaties

British and Colonial Trade, Effect on.
Os. Mr. C. McArthur, *Mar. 17*, 1072; Mr. E. Cecil, *Mar. 17*, 1074; Mr. Emmott, *Mar. 17*, 1079.

Recruiting

Pay—Influence of Increased.
Os. Mr. Winston Churchill, *Mar. 12*, 599; Mr. Arthur Lee, *Mar 12*, 601; Lord Stanley, *Mar. 12*, 644.

Supply—Army Estimates—*Debate* [H.C.] *Mar. 10*, 391.

System criticised.
Os. Mr. Vicary Gibbs, *Mar. 18*, 1120, 1141; Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1128; 1129, 1147, 1162; Mr. Elliot, *Mar. 18*, 1139; Mr. Broadhurst, *Mar. 18*, 1153; Mr. Arthur Lee, *Mar. 18*, 1156; Mr. Courtenay Warner, *Mar. 18*, 1161, 1162; Sir John Brunner, *Mar. 18*, 1162.

Recruits

Medical Examination of—More Thorough Examination, proposed.
Q. Earl of Mayo; *A.* Earl of Hardwicke, *Mar. 19*, 212.

Redmond, Mr. John [Waterford]

Irish Land Bill—Impossibility of introducing at Early Date, *Mar. 10*, 267.

Midland and Belfast, and Northern Counties Railways Bill—Excessive Charges for Carriage of Goods—Reasons in favour of sending Bill to Committee to settle Question of Rates, *Mar. 28*, 1543.

Redmond, Mr. William [Clare, East]

Ennis Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Delay in Sanctioning, Inquiry, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 384.

Flogging of Drummer Boy—Breach of King's Regulations with regard to—Laying on Table of Evidence, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 572.

Innkeepers' Liability Bill — Appeal for Division—Protest Against delay in Discussion of Irish Questions, *Mar. 6*, 23.

Irish Education — Capitation Grant to National School Teachers—Cause of Delay in Payment of, *Mar.* 23, 467.

Irish Land Bill, Possible Date of Introduction of, *Mar. 16*, 860.

St. Louis Exhibition—Irish Industries—Representation of, at, *Mar. 16*, 836, 853.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturdays (Ireland) Bill—Reasons for Support of Bill—Drunkenness in Ireland—Attitude of the Trade—Opinions of the Working Classes, *Mar. 6*, 46.

Registration of Firms Bill

c. 1R.* *Mar. 12*, 590.

Registration of Land Writs in Scotland

see Scotland.

Reid, Sir Robert [Dumfries Burghs]

Supply.

Army Estimates—Motion to go into Committee—Protest Against the Extravagance of Expenditure, *Mar. 10*, 292.

Colonial Vote—South African Affairs—Request for Statement of Expenditure, *Mar. 19*, 1259.

Compensation for Constabulary, *Mar. 19*, 1260.

Expenditure Exclusive of War Costs, *Mar. 19*, 1261.

Navy Estimates.

Contraband of War—Request for Information for Cost of Naval Armaments — Comparison with Foreign Powers—Complaint of Enormous Increase, *Mar. 23*, 1483.

Reid, Sir Robert—*cont.*
Supply—*cont.*
Navy Estimates—*cont.*
Salaries of Officers, etc.—Protest Against Size of the Estimates—Prospect of Further Increase — Colonial Contributions — Colonial Branches of the Navy League—Relations with Foreign Powers, *Mar. 17*, 1018.
Policy of the Government, *Mar. 17*, 1024.
Colonial Contributions, *Mar. 17*, 1048.

Remnant, Mr. J. G. [Finsbury, Holborn]
Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway Bill—Reasons in favour of Bill, *Mar. 11*, 474.
Land Transfer Act, Registration of Titles —Suspension of Registration of Titles until formulation of Scheme for facilitating Registration, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 85.

Remount Department
Organisation and Registration.
O. Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 10*, 309.

Renshaw, Sir Charles [Renfrew, W.
Midland and Belfast and Northern Counties Railways Bill—Appeal for 2R., *Mar. 23*, 1540.

Renwick, Mr. George [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
Supply — Army Estimates — Volunteer Organisation—Objections to the Commission — Necessity for Accessible Rifle Ranges and Adequate Arms—Connection of Volunteers with the Army Corps — Composition of the Volunteer Forces—Complaint of War Office, Attitude towards the Volunteers, *Mar. 9*, 223.

Reserve
Militia, Connection with Increase of.
Os. Mr. Winston Churchill, *Mar. 12*, 598; Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 12*, 597, 598.

Revenue and Expenditure
England, Scotland, and Ireland, Return ordered, *Mar. 17*, 990.

Ribblesdale, Lord
First Grenadier Guards — Condition of, under Colonel Kinloch's command—Lack of Senior Subalterns—Length of Time during which Deficiency lasted, *Mar. 10*, 246.
Shops (Hours of Closing) Bill.
Reasons in favour of Empowering both Urban and District Councils, as well as Borough Councils, to make Provisional Orders for the Regulation of Hours in Shops—Compulsion on the Central Authority to lay Provisional Order before Parliament—Question of Expenditure on obtaining Provisional Order, *Mar. 12*, 526.

Ribblesdale, Lord—*cont.*
Shops (Hours of Closing) Bill—*cont.*
Reasons in favour of, etc.—*cont.*
Answers to Criticism, *Mar. 12*, 533.
Question of the Responsibility of the Local Authority—Objections to Bill—Reasons in favour of Amendment, *Mar. 20*, 1348.
Amendment requiring Provisional Order from Central Authority, *Mar. 20*, 1362.

Rickmansworth Gas Bill
l. Com. Mar. 10, 237.

Ridley, Mr. Forde [Bethnal Green, S.W.]
Alien Immigration—Rejection of immigrants as undesirables at Liverpool, alleged—Number of those who were rejected, but remained, *Mar. 6*, 7.
City and North East Suburban Electric Railway Bill—Reasons for support of Bill — Overcrowding on the Great Eastern Railway, *Mar. 12*, 674.

Ridley, Mr. M. White [Stalybridge]
Church Discipline Bill—Reasons for Support, *Mar. 13*, 799.

Rifle Ranges
Government grants towards acquirement of ranges, Increase of, proposed.
Q. Marquess of Huntly; *A.* Earl of Hardwicke, *Mar. 16*, 813.
New ranges, provision of—Necessity for, under new regulations with regard to length of range, Assistance to be given preferably to old corps in matter of acquisition of new range.
Q. Earl Spencer; *A.* Earl of Hardwicke, *Mar. 16*, 816.
Sum allocated for, 1900-1901—Details of distribution—Return of Papers dealing with, proposed.
Q. Earl of Dartmouth; *A.* Earl of Hardwicke, *Mar. 16*, 811.

Rifles
New Army Rifle—Proposed adoption by Admiralty—Further trials of, previous to final adoption.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 11*, 379.

Ripon, Marquess of
Shops (Hours of Closing) Bill—Question of adjournment in favour of Lord Avebury's Early Closing Bill, *Mar. 12*, 539.

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. T.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Croydon]
Business of the House—Course of Business with regard to Estimates, *Mar. 23*, 1470.
Corn Tax—Export of Offals, Increase in, subsequent to re-imposition of Corn Tax, *Mar. 23*, 1463.

[*cont.*

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. T.—*cont.*

Government Departments—Distribution of Work—form of inquiry into—Report on advisability of equalising scales of salaries of first division officials in accordance with recommendations of Playfair and Ridley Commission, *Mar. 11*, 382.

Imported Milk.

Amount and kind of preservatives contained in, *Mar. 16*, 837.

Examination of insufficient number of samples of—Result of examination of tested samples, *Mar. 10*, 255.

Income Tax, Alteration in Dates of Payment, *Mar. 18*, 1091.

Irish Quit Rents, Proportion of sum received annually as rents, spent in Ireland, *Mar. 18*, 1105.

Local Councils — Government Grants — Payment of — Possibility of further payments in respect of residue (Beer and Spirits Duty) Grant, Comparison of this year's grants with those of last year, etc., *Mar. 16*, 836.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill—Appeal for conclusion of debate, *Mar. 23*, 1553.

Payment of Death Duties on Licensed Property.

Demand following, for surrender of Licences upon which duty had been paid, Remedy of unsatisfactory condition of affairs, *Mar. 9*, 107.

Rate of eighteen and sixteen years' purchase in case of freehold and leasehold property, respectively, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1226.

Public House Licences—Return of portion of licence paid for the time subsequent to closing of house, *Mar. 23*, 1449.

Scotch Whisky—Spirit made from molasses, described and sold as—Employment of English spirit, for blending and bottling operations in Customs Warehouses and under supervision of Revenue officials—alleged, *Mar. 9*, 106.

Sugar and Corn Taxes, Number of articles made liable to Customs duties under—Number of prosecutions for smuggling such articles—amount of penalties recovered, *Mar. 19*, 1227.

Supply.

Army Estimates, Non-effective Votes of—Effect of increase of Army and terms of pay and pension on, *Mar. 11*, 374.

Navy Estimates—Pensions, half-pay, etc.—Discussion on Non-effective Votes, *Mar. 18*, 1116.

Trade, Board of—Constitution of, Nature of Inquiry into, *Mar. 17*, 1000.

Roberts, Earl

First Grenadier Guards Scandal — Corroboration of Statement of Lord de Saumarez by Lord Belhaven, *Mar. 10*, 250.

Roberts, Mr. Bryn [Carnarvonshire, Eifion]

Supply.

Army Estimates.

Land Forces—Protest against Extravagant Expenditure — No probability of Matching British Forces against Continental Armies — Necessity for Reduction, *Mar. 18*, 1156.

Pay of the Army—Responsibility of the Committee, *Mar. 12*, 648.

Colonial Vote—South African Affairs —Native Labour in Mines and Taxation of Natives—Interview of Mr. Chamberlain with Mr. Bosman, *Mar. 19*, 1289, 1290, 1291.

Question of Compensation for Destruction of Private Property, *Mar. 19*, 1291, 1292.

Taxation on South African Natives—Comparison of Tax under British and Transvaal Governments, *Mar. 18*, 1098.

Roberts, Mr. J. H. [Denbighshire, W.]

Congo—Atrocities perpetrated on Natives by Agent of Congo Administration, *Mar. 16*, 836.

Clubs, Number registered under Licensing Act, *Mar. 16*, 851.

Roberts, Mr. S.

Volunteer Artillery, Training of — Consideration of Application from Corps trained as Mobile Artillery, for continuance as such under same conditions as Imperial Yeomanry, *Mar. 23*, 1453.

West Yorkshire Artillery Volunteers—Order with regard to Number of horses to be Employed during Annual Training—Rescission of Order, proposed, *Mar. 16*, 840.

Robertson, Mr. Edmund [Dundee]

Supply.

Army Estimates.

Motion to go into Committee—Appeal for Adequate Compensation for Time and Labour of Volunteers—Protest against the size of the Estimates — Objections to Maintaining a Great Regular Army for Indian Defence—Protest against Ornamental Expenditure — Objections to Excess of Expenditure over Income among English Officers — Defects of Military Education, *Mar. 10*, 283.

Robertson, Mr. Edmund—*cont.*
Supply—*cont.*
Navy Estimates.
Pensions, Half-Pay, etc.—Wages and Pensions of Dockyard Men, *Mar. 18*, 1117.
Protest against Class Distinction in the Navy — Reasons for Training Young Men for the Navy instead of Children—Objections to the Scheme of the Admiralty, *Mar. 16*, 906; Promotion of Warrant Officers, *Mar. 16*, 925; Age of Entry, *Mar. 16*, 931.
Request for justification for expenditure—Diplomatic negotiations with foreign powers, *Mar. 23*, 1498.
Salaries of Officers, etc.—Necessity for examination into the Estimates—Prospects for the future—Relations with Foreign Powers—Colonial Contributions — Exactions on young Naval Officers, *Mar. 17*, 1037.
Shipbuilding Vote, *Mar. 17*, 1045, 1046.

Roche, Mr. [Galway, E.]
Monivea, Technical Institution at—Sum for rent of school building voted but not paid, *Mar. 12*, 587.

Rochester Corporation Tramways and Improvements Bill
l. Com. Mar. 9, 62.

Rochester, Lord Bishop of
Shops (Early Closing) Bill—Interests of the Assistants, *Mar. 20*, 1353.

Rolleston, Sir John [Leicester]
Machinery Rating Bill—Reasons for support, *Mar. 20*, 1415.

Rollit, Sir A. [Islington, S.]
St. Louis Exposition—British and Irish Commercial Industries — Arrangements for representation of, *Mar. 9*, 103.

Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert [Stockton]
British and Colonial Trade — Protest against indiscriminate shipping subsidies, *Mar. 17*, 1084.

Rose, Mr. C. D. [Cambridgeshire, Newmarket]
Alaska.
Boundary Convention, Aim of, *Mar. 23*, 1459.
Boundary Tribunal, Official Nomination of Commissioners on, *Mar. 18*, 1098.
Argentine Finance, Delay in issue of Consular Report on, alleged, *Mar. 9*, 105.

Rosebery, Earl of
Shops (Early Closing) Bill — Choice between two Bills on the same subject, *Mar. 12*, 547, 548.
Shops (Hours of Closing) Bill — Question of Adjournment in favour of Lord Avebury's Early Closing Bill, *Mar. 12*, 532.
Authority of Lord Chancellor, *Mar. 12*, 537, 538.

Round, Rt. Hon. James
Somaliland, Map of, in Tea Room of House, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1454.

Royal Army Medical Corps
India—Pay of Officers—Date of introduction of increased scale of.
Q. Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 11*, 374.

Royal Commission on London Traffic
Os. Mr. D. J. Morgan, *Mar. 12*, 662; Mr. Vicary Gibbs, *Mar. 12*, 663; Sir F. Banbury, *Mar. 12*, 665; Mr. J. Burns, *Mar. 12*, 667; Mr. Bonar Law, *Mar. 12*, 671.

Royal Naval Reserve
see Navy.

Royal Marines
see Navy.

Runciman, Mr. W. [Dewsbury]
Dewsbury Post Office—Improved Sanitary Accommodation—Action with regard to acquirement of new premises in lieu of overcrowding in present premises, *Mar. 23*, 1439.
Supply—Navy Estimates—Justification for expenditure and for numbers of the Navy, *Mar. 23*, 1491; Mercantile Marine, *Mar. 23*, 1496.

Russell, Earl
Marine Insurance Bill—Wording of Contracts, *Mar. 13*, 727.

"Russell," H.M.S.
Machinery, Nature of Defects in—Causing delay in joining Mediterranean Fleet.
Qs. Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore, Sir W. Allan; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 11*, 379.

Russell, Mr. T. W. [Tyrone, South]
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturdays (Ireland) Bill—Evidence of the Committee of 1888—Connection of question with Home Rule—Influence exercised on Members by Licensed Victuallers—Reasons for support of Bill, *Mar. 6*, 37, 43.

Russia
Supremacy of England in India—Dangers to, from Russia.
Os. Major Evans-Gordon, *Mar. 10*, 333; Mr. Emmott, *Mar. 10*, 339; Mr. Gibson Bowles, *Mar. 10*, 348; Sir Charles Dilke, *Mar. 11*, 401; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar 11*, 457.

Russia—*cont.*
  Russia and Persia—Tariff Agreement—Conclusion of.
    Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 17*, 997.

Rutherford, Mr. William [Liverpool, West Derby]
  Church Discipline Bill—Necessity for some adequate Machinery to enforce the obedience of the Clergy—Reasons in favour of present Bill—Appeal for 2R., *Mar. 13*, 772.

Sadler, Colonel [Middlesbrough]
  New German Tariff—Countervailing duties on British Exports to Germany, increase of, alleged—Imposition of duties on German Goods imported into Great Britain, or revision of Tariff, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1217.

St. Louis Exposition
  British and Irish Industries.
    Arrangements for Representation of.
      Qs. Mr. Alfred Davies, Mr. Flavin, Sir A. Rollit; *As.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 9*, 103.
    Appointment of Royal Commission in regard to.
      Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 16*, 853.
      Q. Mr. A. Davis; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 16*, 853.
  Irish Industries—Representation of at.
    Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 16*, 836.
  Western Highland Tweed Industry—Representation of, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 11*, 383.
  Civil Service Estimates for Representation of British and Irish Industries—Amount of Grant in.
    Os. Mr. Dalziel, *Mar. 23*, 1519; Mr. A. Lee, *Mar. 23*, 1522; Sir W. Foster, *Mar. 23*, 1528; Mr. Hayes Fisher, *Mar. 23*, 1528.

St. Paul's Cathedral
  Romanising of Services.
    O. Mr. Austin Taylor, *Mar. 13*, 740.

St. Philip's Chapel (Regent Street) Bill
  l. 2R.* *Mar. 19*, 1209.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturdays (Ireland) Bill
  c. 2R. *Mar. 6*, 27.

Salford Corporation Bill
  l. *Com.* *Mar. 9*, 62.

Salisbury, Bishop of
  Education Act—Schemes under, Number of, providing for appointment of persons nominated or recommended by the Free Church Council, Policy of Board in dealing with such schemes. *Mar. 20*, 1376.

Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill
  c. 1R.* *Mar. 10*, 269.

Samuel, Mr. Harry [Tower Hamlets, Limehouse]
  Customs Boatmen's Grievances, Report of Committee on—Outcome of—Improvements in system and status of employees, *Mar. 9*, 109.

Samuel, Mr. Herbert [Yorkshire, Cleveland]
  Postal Order System—Extension to Colonies proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1104.
  South African Native Labour Question—Conference on—Possible date of Report of, *Mar. 19*, 1224.
  Taxation of South African Natives—Proposed increase in Rate of, *Mar. 18*, 1099.

Samuel, Mr. Stuart [Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel]
  Parcels Post Rates—Low Rates in Germany—Arrangements for placing British Merchants on equal footing with Germans, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1229.

Sandhurst Military College
  Military Cadets—Expenses of second year's training of, defrayed by parents or State.
    Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 20*, 1384.
  Training of Officers.
    Os. Sir A. Hayter, *Mar. 9*, 129; Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 136; Major Rasch, *Mar. 9*, 149; Colonel Lockwood, *Mar. 9*, 156; Mr. Courtenay Warner, *Mar. 9*, 169; Colonel Sandys, *Mar. 9*, 173; Dr. Farquharson, *Mar. 9*, 175.

Sandys, Lieut.-Col. T. M. [Lancashire, Bootle]
  Church Discipline Bill—Objections to Expenses borne by the Bishops—Reasons for support of Second Reading, *Mar. 13*, 801.
  Supply—Army Estimates—Training of Officers—University Candidates—Sandhurst Cadets in camp, *Mar. 9*, 172.

Sanitary Inspection
  Exemption of Government property from, grounds for.
    Q. Colonel Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 23*, 1439.

Saunderson, Col. Rt. Hon. E. J. [Armagh, N.]
  Lurgan Post Office—Possible date of erection of, *Mar. 16*, 838.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturdays (Ireland) Bill
  Point of Order, *Mar. 6*, 54.

Savings Bank
Removal of to West Kensington, necessitating appointment of Telegraph Staff—System of promotion to new appointments.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain; *Mar. 10*, 258.

Scarborough Gas Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 80.
Com. Mar. 9, 80.

School Board Electorate Scotland Bill
c. 2R. *Mar. 18*, 1205.

Schools
High Pavement Board School, Nottingham—Inadequate Accommodation for Scholars, under new rules—Transfer of Scholars to All Saints' National School, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Grant; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 10*, 265.

Schwann, Mr. [Manchester, N.]
China, Anti-Foreign Feeling—Official Reports from Tientsin and Manchuria, regarding — Government Measures, *Mar. 9*, 105.
Manchester Post Office—Dissatisfaction arising from promotion of allowance holders to head postmen's class; and the disregard of Seniors in the Service, *Mar. 9*, 108.
Traction Engines on Public Roads.
Accidents caused by steps for protection of public, from dangers arising from, *Mar. 10*, 262.
Number of accidents caused by traction engines employed in work on Great Northern, Brompton, and Piccadilly Electric Railway—Time of occurrence, instances of negligence, *Mar. 12*, 559.

Scotland
Secretary—Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.
Under Secretary—Sir R. Macleod.
Lord Advocate—Rt. Hon. A. G. Murray.
Solicitor-General—Mr. C. Scott Dickson.
Agriculture Produce, Railway Rates on—
O. Mr. Hanbury, *Mar. 23*, 1524.
Applecross, Ross-shire — Inconvenience arising from lack of bridge at, Action of Congested Districts Board with regard to construction of bridge.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 11*, 372.
Barracks, Lack of Adequate.
O. Mr. Weir, *Mar. 10*, 291.
Church Discipline and the Royal Supremacy.
Os. Lord Hugh Cecil, *Mar. 13*, 757; Mr. Lawson Walton, *Mar. 13*, 757.
Consumption—Provision for treatment of Consumption as an infectious disease by Local Authorities.
Q. Mr. Corbett; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 16*, 837.

Scotland—*cont.*
County Fund, Interpretation of.
O. Lord Balfour of Burleigh, *Mar. 20*, 1366.
Death Certificates—Introduction of Legislation with regard to, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 12*, 583.
Education.
Code of Regulations for Day Schools, presented, *Mar. 13*, 706; *Mar. 13*, 729.
Physical Training—Report Presented, *Mar. 16*, 810, 831.
Education—For Collective Heading, *see also* title Education.
Education Department, Action of the.
Os. Mr. Weir, *Mar. 19*, 1334, 1336; Mr. Graham Murray, *Mar. 19*, 1335, 1336.
Fishing Industry, Defence of.
Os. Mr. Cathcart Wason, *Mar. 17*, 1062; Mr. Weir, *Mar. 17*, 1064.
Forth-Clyde Canal—Consideration of proposal by Defence Committee.
Q. Mr. Caldwell; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 11*, 388; *Os.* Mr. Caldwell, *Mar. 16*, 970.
Halkirk, Caithness — Declaration of as Congested District — Application for Decision.
Q. Mr. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Mar. 6*, 5.
Machinery Assessment.
Os. Mr. Chapman, *Mar. 20*, 1387; Mr. D. A. Thomas, *Mar. 20*, 1394; Sir James Joicey, *Mar. 20*, 1396; Sir W. Houldsworth, *Mar. 20*, 1398; Mr. Ure, *Mar. 20*, 1402.
Mail Service.
Delay in delivery of Mails at Lerwick, alleged.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 10*, 257.
Mail Steamer, "St. Clair"—Omission to leave Scalloway at stated time, and to carry mails.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 10*, 257.
Mallaig, Lochinver, etc. — Petition for Establishment of Steamer Service between—Grant of Annual Subsidy by Congested Districts Board, in Aid of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 18*, 1088.
New Naval Base, Formation of, at St. Margaret's Hope, Firth of Forth.
Os. Mr. Arnold Forster, *Mar. 16*, 578; Mr. Lough, *Mar. 16*, 946; Mr. Caldwell, *Mar. 16*, 969; Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 17*, 1010; Sir Fortescue Flannery, *Mar. 17*, 1026; *Q.* Mr. Black; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 18*, 1097.

[*cont.*

Scotland—*cont.*

Highlands, Lawlessness in.
Os. Mr. J. Dewar, *Mar. 23*, 1534, 1535; Mr. Graham Murray, *Mar. 23*, 1534, 1535; Mr. Cathcart Wason, *Mar. 23*, 1560.

Innkeepers' Liability Bill, Application of.
O. Mr. Eugene Wason, *Mar. 6*, 19.

Land Writs—Registration of—Defective System of Registration of, involving Expense of Time and Labour—Recommendations of Committee to report on Method of Registration, with regard to Adoption of Process of Photo-zincography—Bill to legalize this System of Registration, presented and read, 1A. [Lord Balfour of Burleigh], *Mar. 9*, 74.

Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway Bill.
c. Report,* *Mar. 10*, 253.

Licensing Law.

Introduction of Bill for Consolidation of.
Q. Mr. P. Smith; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 9*, 109.

Number of Burghs losing Licensing Jurisdiction under new Licensing Bill.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 9*, 87.

St. Margaret's Hope—Establishment of Naval Base at—Extent and Rental of Land to be acquired for.
Q. Mr. Black; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 18*, 1097.

Sheep-Worrying—Possible Date of Introduction of Bill with regard to.
Q. Mr. Black; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *Mar. 19*, 1228.

Shetland, *see* that Title.

Town Councils—Petitions for Legislation, *Mar. 23*, 1438.

Trawling, *see* that Title.

Tweed Industry, Western Highlands—Representation of, at St. Louis Exposition, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 11*, 383.

Vaccination—Animal Lymph—Inadequate Supply of—Establishment of Animal Vaccine Station, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 18*, 1089.

Scottish American Mortgage Company
l. 2R.* *Mar. 12*, 520.
*Com.** *Mar. 19*, 1209.

Scunthorpe Urban District Water Bill
l. Com. Mar. 9, 62.

Seaforth and Sefton Junction Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 18*, 1085.

Seely, Major J. E. B. [Isle of Wight]

Supply—Army Estimates—Land Forces—Reasons for Voting for a Reduction of the Estimates—A Reduction of the Establishment to Fighting Strength of the Army, *Mar. 11*, 463.

Pay of the Army—Relative Positions of Army and Navy—Command of the Army Corps—Objections to General Principles of Army Corps Scheme, *Mar. 12*, 627, 630.

Volunteers—Recruiting Statistics, *Mar. 18*, 1093.

Seely, Mr. C. H. [Lincoln]

Church Discipline Bill—Reasons in favour of Reference to a Select Committee—Opposition to Bill in Present Form, *Mar. 13*, 803.

Supply — Navy Estimates — Salaries of Officers, etc.—Naval Gunnery—British Estimates compared with those of Foreign Powers—Colonial Contributions, *Mar. 17*, 1053.

Serpentine

Cleansing of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Bull; *A.* Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes, *Mar. 12*, 563.

Seton-Karr, Sir H. [St. Helens]

Food Supply in Time of War—Government Inquiry into — Constitution, Scope, Date of Appointment, *Mar. 11*, 390.

Servia

Macedonian Affairs, Attitude with regard to.
O. Lord Newton, *Mar. 13*, 707.

Sewage Disposal

Report of Royal Commission Presented, *Mar. 9*, 63, 81.

Shackleton, Mr. [Lancashire, Clitheroe]

Cotton Cloths Factories Acts—Violation of, with regard to Ventilation—Issue of Notice to Firms having Violated Law, on previous occasion, *Mar. 9*, 84,

Shanghai

Consular Jurisdiction—Return Presented, *Mar. 17*, 989; *Mar. 18*, 1087.

Evacuation of, by Foreign Troops—Dates of.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 16*, 835.

Shaw-Stewart, Mr. [Renfrew, E.]

Supply—Education Vote—Physical Training in Schools—Necessity for careful Organisation—System in Scotland *Mar. 19*, 1316.

Shebeens
see Clubs.

Sheehan, Mr. D. [Cork Co., Mid.]
Irish Labourers' Cottage Scheme.
Refusal of Application for Cottage under, on Grounds of Applicant not being an Agricultural Labourer within Meaning of Labourers (Ireland) Acts, *Mar. 23*, 1468.
Substitution of Original Applicant for a Cottage for Another, alleged, *Mar. 18*, 1104.
Irish Private Bill Legislation—Representations urging Necessity for Alteration in System of, *Mar. 16*, 854.
Peat Fuel, Utilisation of—Action of Irish Government with regard to Promotion of Project for, *Mar. 18*, 1105.

Sheffield and South Yorkshire Navigation Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 6*, 1.

Sheffield Corporation Bill
Standing Orders dispensed with, *Mar. 10*, 252.
c. Ordered, *Mar. 11*, 370.
1R.* *Mar. 12*, 557.
2R.* *Mar. 17*, 987.

Shelford and Son
West African Railways, Construction of—Payment of Commission to.
O. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 6*, 5.

Shepshed Urban District Gas Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 16*, 809.

Shetland
Foula—Failure of Oat Crop at, Resulting in great Distress, Measures for Relief.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 10*, 258.

Shipbuilding
New Admiralty Yacht, Basis of Tenders for—Adoption of similar Plan for Harbours, etc., in view of obtaining Alternative Designs and Specifications, proposed.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 23*, 1459.

Shipman, Dr. J. G. [Northampton]
Stray Dogs—Sale of by Police—Payment of Dog Tax by Purchasers, previous to taking Possession of Dog, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1451.

Shipping
Bounties and Subsidies—Question of.
Os. Mr. C. McArthur, *Mar. 17*, 1070; Mr. Evelyn Cecil, *Mar. 17*, 1074; Mr. Emmott, *Mar. 17*, 1079; Sir R. Ropner, *Mar. 17*, 1084.
South African Shipping Ring—Invitations for Tenders from Firms outside Shipping Conference—Names of Firms so invited — Disqualification of City Agents from Shipping by Conference and outside lines.
Qs. Mr. Peel, Mr. A. Davies; *As* Mr. J. Chamberlain, [*Mar. 19*, 1224.

Ships
Casualties—Return ordered, *Mar. 17*, 990.

Shops Bill
l. 1R.* *Mar. 12*, 524.

Shops (Early Closing) Bill
l. 2R. *Mar. 12*, 541.
Com. Mar. 20, 1341.

Shops (Hours of Closing) Bill
l. 2R. *Mar. 12*, 526.

Shropshire, Worcestershire, and East Denbighshire Electric Power Bill
l. Com. Mar. 9, 62.

Shrewsbury
Municipal Election Petition—Report of Commissioner—Issue of, to Members, proposed—Adoption of Measures for Prosecution of Persons alleged to be guilty of Bribery.
Qs. Mr. Lawson Walton; *As.* Sir R. Finlay, *Mar. 23*, 1465.

Sinclair, Captain J. [Forfar]
Supply—Army Estimates—Land Forces in South Africa, *Mar. 10*, 297.

Sinclair, Mr. L. [Essex, Romford]
Trade—Board of—Constitution of, Nature of Inquiry into, *Mar. 17*, 1000.

Sittingbourne District Gas Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 80.
Com. Mar. 9, 80.

Skewes-Cox, Mr. [Surrey, Kingston]
Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway Bill—Instruction concerning Subsoil accepted by promoters of Bill, *Mar. 12*, 679.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]
Irish National School Teachers.
Capitation Grant, Delay in payment of, alleged, *Mar. 19*, 1231.
Grade Regulations—Arrangement of Teachers in their respective grades under New Regulations, *Mar. 12*, 586.
Increments — Grant of, to Trained Teachers in Schools where general proficiency is fair, but attendance is irregular, *Mar. 12*, 586.
Post Offices on Licensed Premises—Return of, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1230.
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturdays (Ireland) Bill—Temptations to drunkenness offered to working men — Reasons in favour of Closing Public Houses at Nine o'clock instead of Eleven on Saturday Night—Lengthy Hours of Assistants in Public Houses —Evidence of the Select Committee of 1888 and of the Royal Commission of 1896, *Mar. 6*, 27.

Smallpox
Liverpool, Number of Cases in.
Q. Mr. Coghill; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 10*, 265.
Outbreak in Lancashire and Yorkshire—Spread of Infection by Tramps, alleged—Action of Board with regard to arresting spread of disease.
Q. Sir J. Leese; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 10*, 264.

Smith, Mr. P. [Lanarkshire, Partick]
Scottish Licensing Law—Introduction of Bill for Consolidation of, *Mar. 9*, 109.
Supply—Army Estimates—Volunteer Organisation—Ammunition and Arms of the Artillery Branch—Necessity for Shooting Ranges—Question of Allowances and Compulsory Camps.

Smith, Mr. S.
India—Water Storage and Navigation Commission — Recommendations of, Carrying out of at early date, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 580.

Soares, Mr. E. J. [Devonshire, Barnstaple]
Braunton (North Devon) Lighthouse—Connection of, with Braunton—Delay in commencement of work, alleged, *Mar. 9*, 90.
London County Council (General Powers) Bill—Supply of Electric Light, Fittings, etc., by Municipalities, *Mar. 23*, 1551.
Supply.
Army Estimates—Pay, Allowances, etc.—Protest against increase in General Staff, *Mar. 18*, 1169.
Civil Service Estimates—Action of Board of Agriculture with regard to Army Remounts, *Mar. 23*, 1519.

Solicitors (Scotland) Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 19*, 1234.

Somaliland
Alleged Object of Campaign to give prominent share to Somali Levies—Foundation for Statement.
Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 12*, 575.
Map of, in Tea Room of House, proposed.
Q. Mr. Round; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 23*, 1454.

Somerset and District Electric Power Bill
l. Com. Mar. 10, 237.

South Africa
Conference Ring, with regard to Freights.
O. Mr. Whitley, *Mar. 19*, 1266.
Colonial Vote, *Debate on*, *Mar. 19*, 1240.
Loans.
Os. Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 19*; 1240, 1244; Mr. Chamberlain, *Mar. 19*, 1244; Mr. Asquith, *Mar. 19*, 1244, 1248; Mr. Black, *Mar. 19*, 1250.

South Africa—*cont.*
Mines, Labour in.
Os. Mr. Keir Hardie, *Mar. 19*, 1251, 1252, 1253, 1254; Mr. Peel, *Mar. 19*, 1254, 1255; Sir Brampton Gurdon, *Mar. 19*, 1259; Mr. J. H. Whitley, *Mar. 19*, 1263; Mr. Lloyd-George, *Mar. 19*, 1267; Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 19*, 1275, etc; Mr. Bryn Roberts, *Mar. 19*, 1289; Mr. Keir Hardie, *Mar. 23*, 1529; Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 23*, 1532; Mr. Cathcart Wason, *Mar. 23*, 1560.
Natives.
Native Labour.
Os. Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 19*, 1240; Mr. Chamberlain, *Mar. 19*, 1243; Mr. Black, *Mar. 19*, 1250; Sir Brampton Gurdon, *Mar. 19*, 1259; Mr. J. H. Whitley, *Mar. 19*, 1263; Mr. Keir Hardie, *Mar. 23*, 1529; Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 23*, 1532; Mr. Cathcart Wason, *Mar. 23*, 1560.
Recruiting of.
Os. Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 19*, 1240; Sir John Gorst, *Mar. 19*, 1248; Mr. Keir Hardie, *Mar. 19*, 1253; Mr. Lloyd-George, *Mar. 19*, 1267; Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 19*, 1275 etc.; Sir John Leng, *Mar. 19*, 1289; Mr. Bryn Roberts, *Mar. 19*, 1289.
Taxation of.
Os. Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 19*, 1240; Mr. Keir Hardie, *Mar. 19*, 1253; Mr. J. H. Whitley, *Mar. 19*, 1264; Mr. Lloyd-George, *Mar. 19*, 1267; Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 19*, 1277 etc.; Mr. Bryn Roberts, *Mar. 19*, 1289.
Troops, considered as a Permanent Station for.
Os. Sir E. Grey, *Mar. 11*, 434; Major Rasch, *Mar. 11*, 466.

South African War
Constabulary.
Compensation of.
Os. Sir Robert Reid, *Mar. 19*, 1260; Mr. Chamberlain, *Mar. 19*, 1260.
Loss of Kit, Compensation for.
Q. Sir E. Strachey; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 6*, 7.
Inefficiency of Officers shown during.
Os. Sir Charles Dilke, *Mar. 9*, 152; Colonel Lockwood, *Mar. 9*, 156; Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Mar. 9*, 160.
King's Medals—Conditions of Eligibility for — Apparent Inconsistency of Awards—Possible date of distribution.
Qs. Sir G. Parker, Sir J. Bartley; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 16*, 842.
Sea Transport Medal — Eligibility of Officers of Ships conveying Troops, to receive Medal.
Q. Captain Jessel; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13*, 731.

[*cont.*

South African War—*cont.*

Transvaal War Contribution—Despatch from Lord Milner on subject of—Presentation of Correspondence, proposed.

Qs. Mr. Black; *As.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 18*, 1100.

War Losses—Grants for—Amount, and in what way expended.

Q. Mr. A. Davies; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 18*, 1100.

South Lancashire Tramways Bill

l. 2R.* *Mar. 16*, 809.
Com. Mar. 23, 1433.

South Shields, Sunderland, and District Tramways Bill

c. 2R.* *Mar. 23*, 1435.
Com. Mar. 23, 1435.

South Staffordshire Tramways Bill

l. 2R.* *Mar. 16*, 809.
Com. Mar. 23, 1433.

South Uist

Distress in, owing to present state of congestion—Possible action of Congested Districts Board with regard to.

Q. Mr. John Dewar; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 23*, 1448.

Southampton Harbour Bill

l. Com. Mar. 9, 62.

Speaker, Rt. Hon. W. C. Gulley [Carlisle]

Case of Colonel Kinloch—Issue of White Paper containing evidence, being one part only of the transaction—Inconsistent with statement made by Secretary of State for War, *Mar. 16*, 858.

Parliamentary Procedure.

Reference to Correspondence involves the laying on the Table of the whole correspondence, *Mar. 12*, 570.

Rules of the House.

Violation of —Writing of absent Members' names on tickets by present Member, in order to secure them places, alleged, *Mar. 9*, 78.

Ruling on Standing Orders—Civil Service Estimates, Vote on account for—Report Stage—Can be debated at Morning Sitting and continued at Evening Sitting although Standing Order says "not more than one Sitting."

Spear, Mr. J. W. [Devon, Tavistock]

Supply—Constitution of the Board of Agriculture—Suggested negotiations with Railway Companies regarding transport of farm produce—Standards of weights and measures, *Mar. 19*, 1339.

Spencer, Earl

Light Locomotives (Ireland) Bill—Reasons for support, *Mar. 16*, 820.

Spencer, Earl—*cont.*

Macedonian Affairs—English feeling on the subject—Responsibility of the Sultan — Necessity for control of the Sultan's reforms, *Mar. 13*, 722.

Prevention of Corruption Bill—Suggested Amendments, *Mar. 20*, 1372.

Shops (Early Closing) Bill.

Motion for Adjournment of Debate, *Mar. 12*, 546.

Motion withdrawn, *Mar. 12*, 549.

Reasons in favour of leaving decision to local authority with provisional order, *Mar. 20*, 1355.

Shops (Hours of Closing) Bill—Question of Adjournment in favour of Lord Avebury's Early Closing Bill, *Mar. 12*, 532, 535.

Volunteer Rifle Ranges — New Ranges' Provision of, Necessity for, under new regulations with regard to length of range—Assistance to be given preferably to old corps in matter of acquisition of new ranges, *Mar. 16*, 816.

Spencer, Rt. Hon. C. R. [Northamptonshire, Mid]

Supply — Army Estimates — Volunteer organisation—Difficulties in the way of Volunteers—Provision of adequate ranges for musketry practice — Expenses of Volunteer Officers—Value of Volunteers to the country, *Mar. 9*, 197.

Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Bill

l. Report,* *Mar. 12*, 521.

Standing Committee

l. Report from Committee of Selection Read, *Mar. 23*, 1434.

Standing Orders

Select Committee on—Discharge of Dr Farquharson — Addition of Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 11*, 369.

Stanhope, Earl

Intrusive Patronage in North Wales—Defence of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners regarding transfer of patronage, &c., *Mar. 9*, 73.

Stanley, Lord—*Financial Secretary to the War Office* [Lancashire, Westhoughton]

Africa, South—Drafts for—Age and size of—Call for Report, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1456.

Army Commissions—Grant of Return in respect of, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1223.

Army Ordnance Department — Tenders for Contract 2/1773—Acceptance of lowest tender, *Mar. 17*, 995.

Army Works Bill—Sum required under—Possible expenditure within next financial year, *Mar. 23*, 1457.

Defence of the Empire—Acquisition of Land for National Defence—Grant of Return relative to, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1457.

[*cont.*

Stanley, Lord—*cont.*
- Explosives Factories—Increased wages for employees, proposed, *Mar. 17*, 994.
- Officers' Uniforms—Issue of circular to firms of tailors for terms for supplying—Exclusion of Irish firms, alleged, *Mar. 11*, 378.
- Officers' Removal — Charges against Officers, *Mar. 11*, 476, 477.
- Range Finders—Result of trials of—Statement proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1457.
- Supply—Army Estimates.
  - Volunteer Organisations — Reforms expected from the Royal Commission—Question of Pay—Necessity for compulsory camps--Temporary nature of the diminution in numbers — Connection of Volunteer system with Army Corps system —Attitude of the War Office towards the Auxiliary Forces, *Mar. 9*, 193, 194, 209, 221.
  - Volunteer Grievances — Ornamental expenditure in the Army--Military Education, &c., *Mar. 10*, 277, 278, 289, 290.
  - Pay of Army—Abolition of Permit Office, *Mar. 12*, 594.
    - Organisation of Army Corps Staff, *Mar. 12*, 617.
    - Reasons against Decentralisation, to Generals of Divisions, *Mar. 12*, 618.
    - Distinction between Divisions and Army Corps, Defence of Army Corps, *Mar. 12*, 620.
    - Defence of Garrison Regiments—Intelligence Department, *Mar. 12*, 642.
    - Increase of pay and effect on recruiting, *Mar. 12*, 646.
  - Pay, Allowances, &c.—Organisation of the Veterinary Department — Reasons for increased cost on China Expeditionary Force, *Mar. 18*, 1168.
- War Office Civil Service Clerks, Return relative thereto, requested, *Mar. 23*, 1456.

Stanley of Alderley, Lord
- North Wales Sees—Transfer of patronage from North Wales Sees to those of South Wales. Action of Ecclesiastical Commission of 1861. Inconveniences arising from practice—Re-transfer of benefices alienated from North Wales, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 63.

Stevenson, Mr. F. S. [Suffolk, Eye].
- Crete Administration—Reports on—Possible date of issue, *Mar. 23*, 1461.
- Macedonia, Reforms in—Issue of information regarding progress of, *Mar. 23*, 1461.
- Supply—Civil Service Estimates—Appeal to Government to secure organisation of *gendarmerie* in European Turkey, *Mar. 23*, 1575.

Stirling-Maxwell, Sir J. [Glasgow College]
- Supply—Army Estimates—Land Forces—Defence of the Indian Frontier—Reasons against a reduction without proof that the size of the Army is too great, *Mar. 10*, 345.

Stock, Mr. [Liverpool, Walton]
- Church Discipline Bill—Objections to Bill, while Giving Support to Second Reading, *Mar. 13*, 798.
- Local Government (Wales and Monmouthshire)—Reasons for Opposition to the Motion, *Mar. 18*, 1186.

Strachey, Sir, E. [Somerset, S.]
- Corn Tax—Export of Offals—Increase in, subsequent to re-imposition of Corn Tax, *Mar. 23*, 1463.
- County Justices of the Peace—Necessary Qualifications, *Mar. 23*, 1465.
- Milk, Imported.
  - Amount and Kind of Preservatives contained in, *Mar. 16*, 837.
  - Examination of Insufficient Number of Samples of—Result of Examination of Tested Samples, *Mar. 10*, 255.
- South African Constabulary—Loss of Kit, Compensation for, *Mar. 6*, 7.
- Supply.
  - Request for Statement regarding the Constitution of the Board of Agriculture, *Mar. 19*, 1337.
  - Civil Service Estimates—Regulations regarding Swine Fever—Railway Rates and Agricultural Produce—Advisory Boards, *Mar.* 23, 1520.
- Swine Fever—Police Prosecution for Omitting to Notify Swine Fever on Farm Premises—Neglect of Inspector alleged, *Mar. 16*, 833.

Stray Dogs
- Sale of by Police—Payment of Dog Tax by Purchasers Previous to Taking Possession of Dog, proposed.
  - *Q.* Dr. Shipman; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 23*, 1451.

Street Traffic Regulation Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Mar. 19*, 1234.

Submarine Boats
- *see* Navy.

Sugar Bounties
- Jamaica—Introduction of Bill empowering guarantee out of General Revenues of Colony and Payment of Interest on Capital Expended on Establishing Sugar Factories—Constitution of such Payments and Guarantees as direct or indirect Bounties—Submission of Question to Permanent Commission at Brussels.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 23*, 1460.

Sugar Tax
Number of Articles made liable to, Customs Duties under—Number of Prosecutions for Smuggling such Articles—Amount of Penalties Recovered.
Qs. Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. Ritchie, *Mar. 19*, 1227.

Superannuation
Treasury Minute—Relating to Appointment of William Barber without Civil Service Certificate, Presented, *Mar. 23*, 1433, 1438.

Supply
Army and Navy Estimates, *see* under titles Army and Navy.
Civil Service and Revenue Department Estimates.
National Gallery, Ireland, Excess Vote £77 15s. 5d., *Mar. 17*, 1003; Report *Mar. 18*, 1110.
Vote on Account, £20,265,000 *Com. Mar 19*, 1236; Report, *Mar. 23*, 1514, 1555.
Colonial Office—£25,000, *Mar. 19*, 1240.
Education, Board of—£6,000,000, *Mar. 19*, 1292.

Surveyors of Taxes
Employment of Clerical Assistants in times of pressure, proposed.
Q. Mr. H. Johnstone; *A.* Mr. Hayes Fisher, *Mar. 12*, 566.

Sutton Coldfield Corporation Bill
l. Com. Mar. 9, 62.

Sutton District Water Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 80.
Com. Mar. 9, 80.

Swine Fever
Public Prosecution for omitting to notify Swine Fever on Farm Premises—Neglect of Inspector, alleged.
Q. Sir E. Strachey; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *Mar. 16*, 833.
Regulations.
Os. Sir E. Strachey, *Mar. 23*, 1520; Mr. Hanbury, *Mar. 23*, 1525.

Talbot, Lord Edmund [Sussex, Chichester]
Public House Licences—Return of Portion of Licence paid for the time Subsequent to Closing the House, *Mar. 23*, 1449

Taff Vale Railway Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 61.

Taylor, Mr. Austin [Liverpool, East Toxteth]
Church Discipline Bill—Ineffectual Efforts of Archbishops and Bishops to secure the obedience of the Clergy with regard to Ritualism—Proposals to Abolish Imprisonment for Contumacious Clergy, also to Abolish the Veto of the Bishops—Romanising of Services in St. Paul's Cathedral—Question of the right to appeal to the Crown, *Mar. 13*, 733.

Taylor, Mr. Austin—*cont.*
Supply—Navy Estimates—Necessity for Efficient Naval Forces to Compete with Foreign Nations—*Personnel* of the Fleet, *Mar. 23*, 1508.

Teachers
see title Education—sub-heading Ireland.

Telegraph Service
Devonport—Decision with regard to request for Improved Service at.
Q. Mr. Kearley; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 12*, 563.
London Appointments—Grounds for Appointment of two Female Technical Officers in preference to Seniors possessing equal Technical Qualifications.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 23*, 1464.
Orkney—Severance of Telegraphic Communication with Westray, Orkney. Efforts for Speedy Restoration of.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 11*, 373.

Tennant, Mr. H. J. [Berwickshire]
South African War Medals—American Nurses on Hospital Ship "Maine"—Refusal of, to Female Nurses, Grounds for Refusal, *Mar. 19*, 1221.

Thames River Steamboat Service
c. Bill ordered, *Mar. 17*, 987.
2R.* *Mar. 18*, 1085.

Thomas, Sir Alfred [Glamorganshire, E.]
Local Government (Wales and Monmouthshire)—Reasons in favour of Local Government concerning Trade, Education, etc., *Mar. 18*, 1174.
Wales—National Museum Grant—Appeal for Financial Aid in Addition to Sympathy, *Mar. 10*, 358.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
Attorney-General's Fiat—Requirements, previous to Granting or Withholding Fiat to Plaintiff, *Mar. 16*, 852.
Canadian and Australian Bounties on Export of Butter and Iron—Importation of Bounty-fed Articles into United Kingdom other than sugar—Protection of Home Industries, *Mar. 16*, 850.
Cost of Military Aid to Civil Power—Charge upon Local Authority seeking Assistance — Legislation proposed, *Mar. 9*, 84.
Government Departments — Distribution of Work—Form of Inquiry into—Report on Advisability of equalising Scales of Salaries of First Division Officials in accordance with Recommendations of Playfair and Ridley Commission, *Mar. 11*, 382.
Machinery Rating Bill — Objections to Bill—Unfavourable attitude of Local Authorities — Effect on Working People's Wages and on the Housing Question—Scottish Application, *Mar. 20*, 1389.

[*cont.*

Thomas, Mr. D. A.—*cont.*

Oil Fuel Storage — Immediate carrying out of Arrangements for Provision of, or Postponement of, until further trials have been made with Oil-fuel, *Mar. 16*, 848.

Oil Fuel Trials on H.M.S. "Hannibal"—General Results of, *Mar. 11*, 378.

Police and Sanitary Regulation Bills—Committee on—Non-Appointment of, during next two years, *Mar. 13*, 732.

Private Bill Committees — Excuses of Members from serving on, on ground of Private Profession — Number of Cases and Number of Excuses accepted, *Mar. 19*, 1225.

Tied Houses (Freeing) Bill

c. 1R.* *Mar. 10*, 269.

Tilbury Docks

Alien Lunatics landed at, and supported by Orsett Union Guardians, alleged.
Q. Lieutenant-Colonel Tufnell; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 10*, 256.

Tomkinson, Mr. J. [Cheshire, Crewe]

Supply—Army Estimates—Land Forces—Importance of the Auxiliary Forces—Defence of Indian Frontier, *Mar. 18*, 1159.

Tomlinson, Sir William [Preston]

London County Council (General Powers) Bill — Supply of Electric Light Fittings by Municipalities, *Mar. 23*, 1547.

Instructions to Committee, *Mar. 23* 1550.

Torquay Corporation Water Bill

l. Com. Mar. 9, 62.

Toulmin, Mr. G. [Lancashire, Bury]

International Postage Rates—Advisability of entering into Negotiations to secure Advantages enjoyed by European Nations for English Commercial Firms, proposed, *Mar. 17*, 999.

Postal Facilities on the Continent—Advisability of securing similar Advantages for this Country, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1219.

Trade

(British and Colonial)—*Debate* [H.C.], *Mar. 17*, 1069.

Protection *v.* Free Trade.
Os. Mr. C. McArthur, *Mar. 17*, 1069; Mr. E. Cecil, *Mar. 17*, 1074; Mr. Emmott, *Mar. 17*, 1079.

Trade, Board of

President—Rt. Hon. G. W. Balfour.

Constitution of, Nature of Inquiry into.
Q. Mr. L. Sinclair; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *Mar. 17*, 1000.

Trade and Commerce

Foreign Undertakings — English Shareholders in — Adherence to Principle of British Commercial Policy that Englishmen invest Capital Abroad at their own risk, with regard to Venezuela.
Q. Mr. Labouchere; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 23*, 1451.

Labour Legislation and Trade Combination—Proposed Course with regard to Motion.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir Fortescue Flannery, *Mar. 23*, 1466.

Trade Reports Presented

Annual Series, *Mar. 12*, 524, 559; *Mar. 16*, 810; *Mar. 17*, 989.

Traffic

Traction Engines on Public Roads—Accidents caused by—Steps for Protection of Public from dangers arising from—Number of Accidents caused by Traction Engines employed in work on Great Northern, Brompton, and Piccadilly Electric Railway—Time of occurrence—Instances of negligence.
Qs. Mr. Schwann, Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 10*, 262; *Mar. 12*, 559.

Training Ships

Establishment of Training Ship at Great Yarmouth, proposed.
Q. Mr. F. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 19*, 1223.

Tramways

London County Council Bill—*Debate* [H.C.] *on* 2R., *Mar. 23*, 1537.

Transport Service

Sea Transport Medal — Eligibility of Officers' of Ships conveying Troops during South African War to receive Medal.
Q. Captain Jessel; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13*, 731.

Stores to South Africa—Conveyance of—Negotiations with Companies violating Fair Wages Resolution, alleged—Employment of British Seamen in preference to Foreigners, proposed.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 12*, 579.

Transvaal

Labour Ordinances—Laying on Table of all Ordinances relating to employment of black and white labour—Changes effected in regulations subsequent to Annexation of Transvaal, etc., proposed.
Qs. Mr. Labouchere; *As.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 12*, 579.

Mines — Employment of Natives in — Statistics of Mortality, Sickness, Desertion, etc.
Q. Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar. 9*, 102.

Trawling—Scotland
Illegal Trawling.
Moray Firth—Trawling in, by British trawlers under Norwegian flag—Possible action of Government.
Q. Mr. Bignold; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar* 9, 87.
Number of convictions for—Names of cruisers assisting in detention—Number of convictions secured through action of Lightermen and Coastguards respectively.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar.* 23, 1448.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [Yorkshire, W.R., Elland]
Transvaal Mines—Employment of Natives in—Statistics of mortality, sickness, desertion, etc., *Mar.* 9, 102.

Tripoli
Coaling Stations at — Statement with regard to establishment of, made in Italian Chamber — Assurances of British Government to the contrary.
Q. Mr. Labouchere; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar.* 23, 1452.

Truman, General
Army Corps Staff—His connection with.
Os. Mr. Gibson Bowles, *Mar.* 12, 1616; Mr. Brodrick, *Mar.* 12, 621, 625; Mr. Charles Hobhouse, *Mar.* 12, 625.

Trustees
Fraudulent Trustees—Cases of—Protection of beneficiaries by compulsory application of Judicial Trustees Act, or establishment of a public trustee or executor.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *Mar.* 17, 989.
Judicial Trustees — Number appointed under Judicial Trustees Act.
Q. Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *Mar.* 23, 1440.

Tufnell, Lt.-Col.
Alien Lunatics landed at Tilbury Docks and supported by Orsett Union Guardians, *Mar.* 10, 256.

Turkey
British Consular Officers in—Increase of number of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar.* 18, 1102.
Macedonia, Government in.
Os. Lord Newton, *Mar.* 13, 706; Lord Bishop of Hereford, *Mar.* 13, 713; Marquess of Lansdowne, *Mar.* 13, 718; Earl Spencer, *Mar.* 13, 722.

Tweedmouth, Lord
Prevention of Corruption Bill—Difference between "corrupt" commissions and others, *Mar.* 10, 241.
Shops (Early Closing) Bill—Choice between two Bills on the same subject, *Mar.* 12, 548.

Tweedmouth, Lord—*cont.*
Shops (Hours of Closing) Bill—Question of adjournment in favour of Lord Avebury's Early Closing Bill, *Mar.* 12, 533, 535, 536, 540.

Tyne Boiler Case
Machinery, Question of rating.
Os. Mr. Chapman, *Mar.* 20, 1386; Mr. D. A. Thomas, *Mar.* 20, 1391.

Uganda Railway
Crown Agent's Commission—Allocation of to what purpose.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar.* 6, 5.
Engineers, Payment of Commission to.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar.* 6, 7.
Material for—Date of purchase of, price and firms from whom it was purchased.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar.* 9, 84.

United States
Alien Immigration—Imposition of further restrictions upon — Steps for prevention of deportation of aliens rejected by United States, to this country.
Q. Mr. M. Hall; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar.* 11, 380.
Food Supply, Connection with English.
Os. Mr. Labouchere, *Mar.* 23, 1478, 1487; Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar.* 23, 1478, 1487; Sir F. Flannery, *Mar.* 23, 1478, 1481.
Postal Rate to—Proposed reduction of—Reopening of negotiations with United States Government, proposed.
Q. Mr. A. Lee; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain, *Mar.* 10, 261.

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act
Statutes of Governing Bodies, Presented, *Mar.* 17, 985, 988.

Urban and District Councils
Shops, Connection with Early Closing of.
O. Lord Ribblesdale, *Mar.* 12, 529.

Ure, Mr. A. [Linlithgowshire]
Edinburgh—Court of Session, Inadequate accommodation in, alleged—Immediate remedy of defect, *Mar.* 12, 583.
Machinery Rating Bill—Reasons in favour of Bill—Position in Scotland, *Mar.* 20, 1401.

Vaccination
Distress Warrants — Costs involved in Execution of Case at Melton Mowbray—Issue of Instructions to Constables with view to Diminishing Excessive Costs of Executing Warrants, proposed.
Q. Mr. Levy; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar.* 19, 1220.

[*cont.*

Vaccination—*cont.*
Scotland—Inadequate Supply of Animal Lymph in—Establishment of Animal Vaccine Station, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Mar. 18*, 1089.
Treatment of Persons Convicted under Acts—Case of Pick and Cokin—Steps for Prevention of similar occurrence.
Q. Mr. Levy; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 9*, 82.
Vagrants—Compulsory Vaccination and Re-Vaccination—Petition for Legislation, *Mar. 11*, 371.

Vagrants
Compulsory Vaccination and Re-Vaccination—Petition for Legislation, *Mar. 11*, 371.

Vincent, Sir Edgar [Exeter]
Supply—Army Estimates.
Increase of Army and Pay and Pension Schemes — Effect on Non-Effective Votes of, *Mar. 13*, 730.
Land Forces — Volunteers as Home Defence—Protest against Size of Army—Expenditure by the Taxpayers without an adequate return, *Mar. 11*, 437.
Non-Effective Votes of—Effect of Increase of Army and Terms of Pay and Pension on, *Mar. 11*, 374.

Vincent, Sir Howard [Sheffield, Central]
Alien Paupers—Number of, in this Country, and particularly in London, *Mar. 10*, 265.
Fraudulent Trustees, Cases of—Protection of Beneficiaries by Compulsory Application of Judicial Trustees Act, or Establishment of a Public Trustee or Executor, *Mar. 7*, 989.
Motor Cars, Registration of, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1102.
Parliament—House of Commons, Hours of Meeting—Proposal for Members to meet at 2 o'clock instead of 2.30 on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and for Termination of Questions to take place at 3-25 instead of 2-55, *Mar. 11*, 388.
Supply — Army Estimates — Volunteers Organisation — Constitution of the Royal Commission—Injustice of the Regulations of 1901—Causes of the diminution in the strength of the Volunteer Forces—Difficulties of compulsory camps — Appeal for representation of the Volunteers and Militia at Headquarters — Financial questions—Connection of the Volunteers with the Army Corps—Difficulty of carrying out Musketry Regulations —Plea for fixed Regulations—Volunteer Allowances, *Mar. 9*, 189, 199, 211, 231.

Vincent, Sir Howard—*cont.*
Volunteers—Council of Advice with regard to, Construction of, Submission of new Musketry Regulations to, *Mar. 20*, 1384.

Volunteer Organisation
Supply—Army Estimates, *Mar. 9*, 177.

Volunteers
Artillery—Training of, Consideration of applications from corps trained as Mobile Artillery, for continuance as such under same conditions as Imperial Yeomanry.
Q. Mr. S. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 23*, 1453.
Bandoliers—Unsuitability of those employed during South African War, Issue of suitable equipment.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 16*, 839.
Council of Advice, Constitution of—Submission of New Musketry Regulations to.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 20*, 1384.
Grievances of.
Os. Mr. Wylie, *Mar. 10*, 276; Lord Stanley, *Mar. 10*, 277.
Home Defence.
Consideration as.
Os. Sir Edgar Vincent, *Mar. 11*, 438; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 11*, 454.
Organisation as.
Os. Mr. Beckett, *Mar. 18*, 1135; Mr. Tomkinson, *Mar. 18*, 1160.
Inclusion of, in total strength of Army—Number of Staff.
Q. Mr. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 94.
Officers.
Compulsorily retired Officers placed on half-pay—Details with regard to, requested.
Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1094.
Number of, holding "Q" and "T" certificates respectively.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1095.
Resignations—Number of since May, 1902.
Q. Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 6*, 8.
Position of—Supply—Land Forces, *Mar. 10*, 294.
Recruiting Statistics.
Q. Major Seely; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1093.
Rifle Ranges.
Government Grants towards Acquirement of Ranges—Increase of, proposed.
Q. Marquess of Huntly; *A.* Earl of Hardwicke, *Mar. 16*, 813.

[*cont.*

Volunteers—*cont.*
Rifle Ranges—*cont.*
New Ranges, Provision of—Necessity for, under New Regulations with regard to Length of Range—Assistance to be given preferably to old Corps in matter of Acquisition of New Ranges.
Q. Earl Spencer; *A.* Earl of Hardwicke, *Mar. 16*, 816.
Sum Allocated for 1900-1901—Details of Distribution—Return of Papers dealing with, proposed.
Q. Earl of Dartmouth; *A.* Earl of Hardwicke, *Mar. 16*, 811.
Training of Officers.
Os. Colonel Long, *Mar. 9*, 120; Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Mar. 9*, 160; Mr. Llewellyn, *Mar. 9*, 161.
West Yorkshire Artillery—Order with regard to Number of Horses to be Employed during Annual Training—Rescission of Order, proposed.
Q. Mr. S. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 16*, 840.

Wales
Ecclesiastical Patronage — Intrusive Nature of—*see* Church.
Local Government [c.] *Mar. 18*, 1171.
National Museum Grant [c.] *Mar. 10*, 350.

Walker and Wallsend Union Gas Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 80.
Com. Mar. 9, 80.

Waltham Abbey
Sanitary Inspector — Exemption of Government Property from Visits of, Grounds for.
Q. Colonel Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Hayes Fisher, *Mar. 19*, 1217; *Mar. 23*, 1439.

Walton, Mr. J. [Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley]
China—Wuchang Viceroy — Re-instatement of Chang-Chiti-Tung—Influence of British Government to Secure, in Recognition of Services Rendered to Foreigners during Boxer Rising, *Mar. 9*, 103.
Musical Copyright — Introduction of Measure to amend Musical Copyright Act, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 85.

Walton, Mr. Lawson [Leeds, S.]
Church Discipline Bill—Reasons for Support of the Bill — Advisability of increasing the Royal supremacy—Reasons for the inaction of the Laity—Relief of Bishops from vexatious Litigation, *Mar. 13*, 756.
Machinery Rating Bill—Interests of Working Classes—Reasons for support of Bill, *Mar. 20*, 1410.
Municipal Election Petition—Report of Commissioner—Issue of, to Members, proposed—Adoption of Measures for Prosecution of Persons alleged to be Guilty of Bribery, *Mar. 23*, 1465.

Warner, Mr. Courtenay [Staffordshire, Lichfield]
City and North-east Suburban Electric Railway Bill—Reasons for Support of Bill — Overcrowding on the Great-Eastern Railway, *Mar. 12*, 674.
Supply.
Army Estimates.
Land Forces — Importance of ascertaining age of Recruits, *Mar. 18*, 1161, 1162.
Pay of Army — Motion for a reduction—Defects in Army Corps System, *Mar. 12*, 610.
Control of the average Number of Men, *Mar. 12*, 649.
Pay, Allowances, etc.—Protest against extravagant Expenditure — Plea for a reduction, *Mar. 18*, 1167.
Retired Pay, etc.—Decrease of Number of General Officers on Retired Pay, *Mar. 18*, 1170.
Retired Pay—Effect of Mobilisation of the Number of Officers on half-pay, *Mar. 12*, 686.
Non-Effective Votes, *Mar. 12*, 693.
Number of Generals on half-pay, *Mar. 12*, 695.
Training of Officers—Sandhurst Curriculum — Necessity for Education in Strategic and Commissariat work—Plea for the Establishment of larger Depôts for the Training of Recruits, *Mar. 9*, 168.
Civil Service Estimates — Advisory Boards and advice on Agriculture matters, *Mar. 23*, 1522.

War Office
Civil Service Clerks—Return relative to, requested.
Qs. Mr. Flavin; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 23*, 1456.
General Staff, Expenditure on.
O. Mr. W. Churchill, *Mar. 12*, 593.
Organisation, Outside influences interfering with.
O. Mr. Pirie, *Mar. 11*, 478.
Position and Organisation of.
Os. Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 10*, 305; *Mar. 10*, 318; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Mar. 10*, 317; Mr. Guest, *Mar. 10*, 320; Major Evans-Gordon, *Mar. 10*, 332.

Warrant Officers
see Navy.

"Wash"
Date of purchase, price paid, cost of maintenance.
Q. Mr. Kearley; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 10*, 261.

Wason, Mr. C. [Orkney and Shetland]
  Orkney Telegraph Service—Severance of telegraphic communication with Westray, Orkney—Efforts for speedy restoration of, *Mar. 11*, 373.
  Scotch Mail Service—Mail Steamer "St. Clair"—Omission to leave Scalloway at stated time and to carry mails—Delay in delivery of Mails at Lerwick, alleged, *Mar. 10*, 257.
  Shetland and Foula—Failure of oat crop at, resulting in great distress—Measures for relief, *Mar. 10*, 258.
  Supply.
    Civil Service Estimates.
      Appeal on behalf of the Highlanders of Scotland—Recruiting of native labour for South African mines, *Mar. 23*, 1560.
      Grievances of the Crofters in the Highlands of Scotland, *Mar. 23*, 1536.
    Navy Estimates.
      Salaries of officers, etc.—Colonial Contributions—Reliance of Colonies on British Navy—Defence of the Scottish fishing industry—Reasons for granting money required, *Mar. 17*, 1062, 1063.

Wason, Mr. Eugene [Clackmannan and Kinross]
  Innkeepers' Liability Bill—Reasons in favour of Bill—Advisability of reference to Grand Committee—Application to Scotland, *Mar. 6*, 19.
  Local Government (Wales and Monmouthshire)—Reasons for support of Resolution—Comparison of Welsh and Scotch privileges, *Mar. 18*, 1182.

Watford and Edgeware Railway Bill
  c. 2R.* *Com. Mar. 10*, 251.

Ways and Means
  Committee of, not to be interrupted under Standing Order and to be entered upon at any hour though opposed (Mr. A. J. Balfour), *Mar. 19*, 1235.

Weights and Measures
  Standards, Regulation of.
    O. Mr. Spear, *Mar. 19*, 1340.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
  Army Recruiting—Rejections on account of Defective Teeth—Percentage of, for present year, *Mar. 18*, 1093.
  Scotland.
    Applecross, Ross-shire—Inconvenience arising from lack of bridge at—Action of Congested Districts Board with regard to construction of bridge, *Mar. 11*, 372.
    Death Certificates—Introduction of legislation with regard to, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 583.

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
  Scotland—*cont.*
    Illegal Trawling—Number of convictions for—Names of cruisers assisting in detection, Number of convictions secured through action of lightermen and coastguards respectively, *Mar. 23*, 1448.
    Port of Ness Breakwater, Lewis, Damage done to, during storm, *Mar. 18*, 1088.
    Port Ness Harbour, Lewis—Publication of report on condition of, *Mar. 18*, 1088.
    Steamer Service between Mallaig, Lochinver, etc.—Petition for establishment of—Grant of annual subsidy by Congested Districts Board in aid of, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1088.
    Vaccination — Animal Lymph, inadequate supply of—Establishment of animal vaccine station, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1089.
    Western Highland Tweed Industry—Representation of, at St. Louis Exposition, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 383.
  Supply.
    Army Estimates—Motion to go into Committee—Lack of adequate barrack-room in Scotland, *Mar. 10*, 291.
    Education Vote—Complaint of the Scottish Education Department—Physical training in Scotland, *Mar. 19*, 1334, 1336.
    Navy Estimates—Salaries of Officers, etc. — Inadequate defence of Scottish Fisheries, *Mar. 17*, 1064.

Welby, Lieut.-Col. A. C. [Taunton]
  Army.
    Horses—Conditions of Classification of Horses as effective—Distinction in Army Estimates between Remount and Effective Horses, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1096.
    Officers' Removal—Reasons for support of the Motion—Right of officers to have cases tried by Court-Martial, *Mar. 11*, 482.
    Returns—Conditions of Classification of Regulars as effective—Distinction in Army Estimates between Recruits and Effectives, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1096.
    Strength of, as shown in Army Estimates, page 12—Number of Effectives of all Ranks—Proportion of fully trained Men to total number, *Mar. 9*, 97.
  Supply—Army Estimates—Pay of Army—Appeal for Detailed Account of Army Corps expenditure—Objections to Army Corps System, *Mar. 12*, 606.

[*cont.*

Welby, Lieut.-Col. A. C.—*cont.*
Supply—*cont.*
Argument in favour of Divisions while objecting to Army Corps, *Mar. 12*, 619, 620.

Wellingborough and District Tramroads Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 23*, 1436.
Com. Mar. 23, 1436.

Wemyss, Earl of
Licensing Act Amendment Bill—Reasons in favour of Uniformity in the granting of Licences, *Mar. 19*, 1214.
Militia Ballot Bill—Importance of Home Defence, *Mar. 13*, 723, 724, 725.
Obsolete Nature of present Militia Act, *Mar. 13*, 726.

Shops (Early Closing) Bill.
Consideration of other Bills on the same subject, *Mar. 20*, 1342.
Other Bills on the subject, *Mar. 20*, 1348.
Rejection of Bill suggested, *Mar. 12*, 532.

West Bromwich Corporation Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 19*, 1209.

West Indies Relief Fund
Distribution of—Amount allocated to each Colony—Principle of Distribution.
Qs. Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Mar. 19*, 1225.

Westminster Bridge
Tramways on.
Os. Sir F. Banbury, *Mar. 23*, 1537; Sir J. Blundell Maple, *Mar. 23*, 1537.

West Sussex Water Bill
Bill withdrawn, *Mar. 18*, 1085.

White, Mr. Patrick [Meath, N.]
Innkeepers' Liability Bill—Objections to Bill as Coercive and Restrictive with regard to Innkeepers—Unnecessary Legislation, *Mar. 6*, 15.

Whiteley, Mr. George [Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey]
Supply—Army Estimates—Pay, Allowances, etc.—Request for Statement concerning China Expeditionary Force, *Mar. 18*, 1167.

Whitley, Mr. J. H. [Halifax]
Education Act—Schemes for Approval—Number submitted to Board of Education—Number having received Final Approval, *Mar. 9*, 86.
Supply.
Army Estimates.
Expenses of Officers, *Mar. 9*, 235.
Pay, Allowances, etc.—Point of Order, *Mar. 18*, 1168.

Whitley, Mr. J. H.—*cont.*
Supply—*cont.*
Army Estimates—*cont.*
Rewards for Meritorious Services, *Mar. 18*, 1170.
Retired Pay — Employment of Soldiers on Half-pay—Amount of Rewards for Distinguished Service, *Mar. 12*, 684.
Reason for Adjournment to report Progress, *Mar. 12*, 692.
Colonial Vote—South African Affairs—Protest against Compulsory Labour in Mines—Taxation of the Natives — Objection to Loan—Protest against Conference Ring in Freights, *Mar. 19*, 1263.
Navy Estimates—Pensions, Half-pay, etc.—Protest against voting large sums without discussion, *Mar. 18*, 1116.

Whitmore, Mr. C. A. [Chelsea]
London County Council (General Powers) Bill — Powers of Municipalities—Instructions to Committee, *Mar. 23*, 1552.

Wigan Corporation Tramways Bill
c. Report,* *Mar. 10*, 252.
Ordered, *Mar. 11*, 369.
1R.* *Mar. 12*, 557.
Petition for additional provision, *Mar. 13*, 728.
c. 2R.* *Mar. 17*, 987.

Willesden Urban District Council Bill
l. Com. Mar. 9, 62.

Williams, Colonel R. [Dorset, W.]
Supply — Education Vote—Financial difficulties of the County Councils—Appeal to the Treasury—Inspection of schools, *Mar. 19*, 1324.

Williams, Mr. Osmond [Merionethshire]
Local Government (Wales and Monmouthshire) — Reasons in favour of a separate national and legislative life for Wales, *Mar. 18*, 1187.

Williams, Mr. Powell
Alien Criminals.
Number of, proportion of, to total prison population — Cost of detention — Restoration of criminals to native country on expiration of sentence, *Mar. 18*, 1103.
Return—Addition to, of total cost of carrying out sentences passed upon criminals, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 108.
Army Officers' Expenses, Reduction of, thus enabling officers to meet expenses without recourse to private means, *Mar. 9*, 97.

Wilson, Mr. F. [Norfolk, Mid.]

Training Ship, establishment of, at Great Yarmouth, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1223.

Wilson, Mr. Henry [York, W.R., Holmfirth]

Machinery Rating Bill—Discrimination between light and heavy machinery—Reason for opposition to Bill, *Mar. 20*, 1428.

Wilson, Mr. J. [Durham, Mid.]

Durham Drill Hall—Contribution from Government Funds towards Cost of Erection, Proportion of, to Total Cost—Employment of Hall for other than Military purposes, *Mar. 18*, 1092.

Machinery Rating Bill — The working man's point of view—Reasons for opposition, *Mar. 20*, 1416.

Wilson, Mr. J. W. [Worcester, N.]

Liberation of Slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba—Recommendation to Sultan's Government for abolition of regulations with regard to payment of compensation in order to facilitate, *Mar. 18*, 1089.

Wilson, Mr. S. [Yorks., E.R., Holderness]

Special Greenwich Hospital Pensions, Extension of, to fifty chief petty officers, *Mar. 23*, 1444.

Winchester Water and Gas Bill

c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 80.
Com. Mar. 9, 83.

Wines Imported

Return ordered, *Mar. 17*, 989.

Winter, Captain

Case of, Possible action of authorities with regard to Captain Winter, under conviction for assaulting natives.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 23*, 1450.

Wireless Telegraphy, Marconi System

Coastguard Signal Stations — Names of Stations at present and about to be fitted with apparatus.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 23*, 1457.

Wolverton, Lord

Electric Lighting (London) Bill, 2R. *Mar. 19*, 1211.

Mercantile Marine, Master Mariners—Pensions for, Amount expended on. out of annual income of Trinity House Corporation, Method of application for pensions—Conditions on which they are granted, *Mar. 9*, 78

Pensions for Master Mariners, *Mar. 9*, 77.

Steam Boilers in Motor Cars, Increasing employment of, danger arising from—System of inspection to which boilers are subjected, *Mar. 19*, 1212.

Wood Green Urban District Council Bill

c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 80.
Com. Mar. 9, 80.

Woolwich Election

Working Classes, Connection with the Interests of the.
O. Earl of Lytton, *Mar. 12*, 556.

Working Classes

Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway Bill — Connection with Housing Question.
O. Mr. C. Hay, *Mar. 11*, 471.

Railways, Overcrowding of.
O. Mr. Forde Ridley, *Mar. 12*, 675.

Workshops and Factories

Cotton Cloths Factories Acts—Violations of, with Regard to Ventilation—Issue of Notice to Firms having Violated Law on previous occasion.
Q. Mr. Shackleton; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 9*, 84.

Worthing Corporation [Tramways] Bill

l. Com. Mar. 9, 62.

Wortley, Mr. Stuart [Sheffield, Hallam]

Machinery Rating Bill—Report of Royal Commission, Reasons for Opposition to Bill, *Mar. 20*, 1427.

Wright, Mr. Whitaker

Escape of, alleged—Neglect of Necessary Precautions for Prevention of—Duty of Executive to bring him to Justice.
Qs. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 11*, 383, 515; *Mar. 12*, 582.

Prosecution of, Institution of Proceedings Against at Expense of Creditors—Reconsideration of Decision with regard to Public Prosecution, proposed.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *Mar. 12*, 581.

Charges of, to Crown rather than to Creditors, proposed.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *Mar. 16*, 852.

Wylie, Mr. [Dumbartonshire]

Supply—Army Estimates—Motion to go into Committee—Grievances of Volunteers—Long and Arduous Services Demanded without Adequate Allowance and Facilities — Appeal for Modification of Camp Regulations—Question of Rifle Ranges and Ammunition — Necessity for more Liberal Arrangements with regard to Drill-halls — Training of Officers—Value of Volunteers to the Country, *Mar. 10*, 276.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Dover]

Afforestry—Consideration by Irish Board of Agriculture of, Recommendation of Committee on British Forestry, with view to promoting, *Mar. 18*, 1104.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
Ancient Monument at Greenan, Londonderry — Arrangement between Proprietor and Commissioners of Public Works with regard to, *Mar. 18*, 1091.
Ballylaneen—Extra Police at—Reason for Reinforcement—Cost of, and to whom charged, *Mar. 16*, 838.
Buncrana Barracks—Delay in Erection, alleged, *Mar. 17*, 994.
Burtonport Extension Railway — Steps towards securing Charge of Reasonable Rates and Fares on, *Mar. 19*, 1222.
Canal Rates—Representations of Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction to Railway and Canal Commissioners, with regard to excessive rates charged by Midland Great Western Railway, *Mar. 23*, 1452.
Cladnageragh Pier—Extension of—Steps for provision of carrying out, *Mar. 11*, 386.
Cork Assizes—Opening of, on St. Patrick's Day—Postponement of, proposed, *Mar. 16*, 854.
Courts of Conscience—Annual Returns—to whom made—Number of Cases tried in Limerick Court in 1902, *Mar. 10*, 267.
Dublin—Housing of the Working Classes in — Unsatisfactory Condition of — Introduction of measure during present Session with view to amending Law affecting Town Tenants, etc., *Mar. 9*, 92.
Dublin University—Women's Degrees—Application for power to confer Degrees upon Women—Result of request, *Mar. 17*, 993.
Education.
  Capitation Grant to National School Teachers—Cause in delay of payment of, *Mar. 23*, 1467.
  Grants, Apportionment of—Equivalent to Grant for English Education under new Act—Consideration of representations made at Dublin Educational Conference, *Mar. 23*, 1453.
  National School Teachers—*see* that subheading.
Ennis Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Delay in sanctioning—Inquiry proposed, *Mar. 11*, 384.
Estates for Sale in the Land Judges Court—Number and Acreage of, Names of owners, *Mar. 16*, 839.
Fisheries.
  Close Season, injury done to fishing industry during — Extension of Close Season between Clougher Head and Belfast Lough, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1091.
  County Down—Early Closing of Fishing Season in—Inquiry with view to extension of season, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 587.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
Fisheries—*cont.*
  North Dublin — Injury done to — by Trawlers—Inquiry into Circumstances, proposed, *Mar. 23*, 1468.
Fitzmaurice Estate—Condition of, as regards sale to tenants—Amount disposed of, sale price, steps for disposal of further portions, *Mar. 23*, 1468.
Gillmor's Lands, Co. Leitrim—Sale of, Institution of Inquiry into circumstances attending sale, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 385.
Hourihane, Police Sergeant—Evidence and conduct of, during hearing of Charleville Licensing Case, and on other occasions—Action of Constabulary Authorities with regard to, *Mar. 12*, 585.
Intermediate Schools, Inspection of — Diminution in number of Inspectors, alleged—Steps towards placing inspection of intermediate schools on permanent basis, *Mar. 9*, 110.
Justices of the Peace, Appointment of working men as—Representations to Lord Chancellor, with regard to these appointments, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 91.
Killea, Disturbance at — Unauthorised action of Police during, Result of Inquiry into Affair, *Mar. 16*, 855.
Labourers' (Ireland) Act, Return—Grant of, proposed, *Mar. 12*, 568.
Labourers' Act in Galway, Unexpended Balances under, *Mar. 18*, 1092.
Labourers' Cottages.
  Grant for encouragement of building of—Application of unexpended balance of grant to counties having already availed themselves of grant, proposed, *Mar. 18*, 1092.
  Limerick Co. — Application of T. O'Brien for Cottage and Plot under Labourers' Acts—Grant of, at recent inquiry, *Mar. 10*, 266.
Labourers' Cottage Scheme.
  Refusal of Application for Cottage under on grounds of Applicant not being an Agricultural Labourer within meaning of Labourers (Ireland) Acts, *Mar. 23*, 1468.
  Substitution of original Applicant for a Cottage for another alleged, *Mar. 18*, 1104.
Land Conference—Printing and Circulation of Papers dealing with Land Conference and Resolution, and Statement on Irish Land Purchase of Landlords' Convention, *Mar. 9*, 93.
Land Purchase.
  Co. Wicklow—Delay in Delivery of Deed of Conveyance subsequent to Payment of Purchase Money—Case of Miss Hefferman, *Mar. 11*, 387.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*

Land Purchase—*cont.*

Leitrim—Gillmor's Case—Extent of Holding purchased under Terms of Agreement with Money advanced by Land Commission, *Mar. 9*, 112.

Limerick—Roxboro' Road School.

Accumulation of Rents of, in Hands of Commissioners—Amount of, previous to Enquiry by Education Endowments Commission, *Mar. 9*, 112.

Expenditure on Repairs of, Legality of, Authority for Assertion by and Name of Auditor, *Mar. 11*, 384; *Mar. 23*, 1467.

Lismore Workhouse Mastership—Institution of Legal Proceedings against Board of Guardians for retaining Mr. G. M'Donald as Master of Workhouse, *Mar. 16*, 854.

Listowel Union—Erection of Labourers' Cottages in—Delay of, alleged, *Mar. 12*, 567.

Loughrea (Galway) Loan Fund—Consideration of Scheme by Loan Fund Board—Possible Date of coming into operation, *Mar. 9*, 91.

Monivea—Technical Institution at—Sum for Rent of School Building voted, but not paid, *Mar. 12*, 587.

National School Teachers.

Assistant Teachers.

Compulsory Return of Names of Teachers giving Instruction in Extra Subjects—*e.g* Irish in National Schools, *Mar. 12*, 567.

Transfer of Teachers of High Classification and Long Service from Third to Second Grade, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 93.

Capitation Grant—Delay in Payment of, alleged, *Mar. 19*, 1231.

Grade Regulations—Arrangement of Teachers in their respective Grades under New Regulations, *Mar. 12*, 586.

Increments, Grant of, to Trained Teachers in Schools where General Proficiency is Fair, but Attendance Irregular, *Mar. 12*, 586.

Repairs to Schools and Residences Obligatory on, *Mar. 9*, 92.

Salaries of—Petition for Inquiry into System of Fixing Salaries under the New Rules, Grant of, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 111.

Peat Fuel, Utilisation of—Action of Irish Government with regard to Promotion of Project for, *Mar. 18*, 1105.

Phœnix Park, Dublin—Destruction of Trees in, during Gale—Sale of Timber and Replantation of Devastated Area, proposed, *Mar. 11*, 388.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*

Primary Education—Allocation of Grant to—Decision with Regard to, *Mar. 19*, 1231.

Private Bill Legislation—Representations urging necessity for Alteration in System of, *Mar. 16*, 854.

Rathmines Police Rate, Increase of—to what cause due—Application of Surplus to what Fund, *Mar. 11*, 386.

Roscrea Labourers' Cottage Scheme—Erection of Cottage proposed, Sanction refused by Local Government Board, *Mar. 16*, 854.

Roxboro' Road School, *see* subheading Limerick.

Royal Irish Constabulary—Recommendations of Commission on, with regard to Pensions and Lodging Allowance, Possibility of speedily giving effect to, *Mar. 17*, 993.

St. Louis Exposition, Representation of Irish Industries at, *Mar. 16*, 853.

St. Patrick's Day—Postponement of Local Government Audits fixed for, *Mar. 12*, 568.

Seed Potatoes for Ireland—Publication of Names and Quantities of, required, so that English Growers may have opportunity of Tendering for Supply, *Mar. 9*, 110.

Swinford Seed Loan — Claim of Commissioners of Works in connection with Interest on Loan under Seed Supply and Potato Spraying Act—Cancelling of Claim, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 111.

Templemore Disturbances—Investigation into—Completion and Result of, *Mar. 23*, 1469.

Training Colleges.

Financial Aid given to—Discrimination between Denominational and Undenominational Colleges as regards Amount of Grant—Grant of Equal Privileges, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 266.

Return relative to—Grant of, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1231.

Urban Districts—Return, Grant of, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 91.

White Estate, near Bantry—Delay in Sale of, alleged—Expediting of Disposal to Tenants, proposed, *Mar. 19*, 1231.

Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H. [Glamorgan South]

Cavalry — Abolition of Lance, Grounds for, *Mar. 16*, 840.

Lance *v.* Sword—Issue of Order with reference to Substitution of Lance for Sword, on approval of Inspector-General of Cavalry, *Mar. 12*, 576.

Wales — National Museum Grant — Museum regarded as the Natural Sequence of the Welsh Educational System, *Mar. 10*, 355.

Yeomanry

Offic-rs, Number of, holding "Q" and "T" certificates respectively.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 18*, 1095.

Yerburgh, Mr. [Chester]

Supply.

Army Estimates—Land Forces—Authority for reduction of the Army, *Mar. 18*, 1147.

Navy Estimates—Salaries of Officers, etc.—Formation of the Navy League, *Mar. 17*, 1021.

Justification for Estimates—Efficiency of the Navy—Necessity for preparedness for War—Position of Naval Officers—Age of entry—Value of Submarines, etc., *Mar. 17*, 1034.

Yorkshire

Smallpox—Outbreak of—Spread of Infection by tramps, alleged—Action of Board with regard to arresting spread of disease.
Q. Sir J. Leese; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 10*, 264.

Youthful Offenders Act

Order in Council Applying certain Provisions to Day Industrial Schools, Presented, *Mar. 17*, 985.

Yoxall, Mr. [Nottingham, W.]

Education Act — Applications under Section 11 (i), Number and Nature of—Orders for transformation of undenominational into denominational teaching—Possible Action of Board with regard to, *Mar. 23*, 1446.

Naval Schoolmasters—Promotion of—Extension of privileges of promotion granted to other ranks of Naval Warrant Officers, *Mar. 23*, 1442.

School Trust Deeds—Applications for variation of—Applications for, in schools where they previously did not exist—Number of cases of schools formerly undenominational becoming denominational, *Mar. 10*, 255.

Supply—Education Vote—Physical training in Schools—Inspection of Schools—Denominational and Undenominational Schools, *Mar. 19*, 1320.

Zanzibar

Liberation of Slaves in—Recommendation to Sultan's Government for Abolition of Regulations with regard to payment of Compensation, in order to facilitate.
Q. Mr. J. W. Wilson; *A.* Lord Cranborne, *Mar. 18*, 1089.